United Nations S/PV.6162

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6162nd meeting

Wednesday, 15 July 2009, 11.50 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Rugunda	(Uganda)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Koudougou
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Guillermet
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. De Rivière
	Japan	Mr. Takasu
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	Turkey	Mr. Çorman
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Parham
	United States of America	Ms. DiCarlo
	Viet Nam	Mr. Dang Hoang Giang

Agenda

The situation in Afghanistan

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security (S/2009/323)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-40425 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Afghanistan

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Afghanistan and its implications for international peace and security (S/2009/323)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Afghanistan, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tanin (Afghanistan) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council welcomes the Afghan-led preparation for the upcoming presidential and provincial council elections and stresses the importance that the elections be free, fair, transparent, credible, secure and inclusive. The Security Council also calls upon the people of Afghanistan to exercise their vote in this historic opportunity for all Afghans to make their voices heard. The Security Council calls on all parties concerned to adhere to the fundamental principles laid out in the electoral law and all other relevant regulations, the Presidential Decree on non-interference in election affairs, and the Guidelines issued by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General to ensure a credible electoral process. It reaffirms the primary responsibility of the Afghan Government and the Independent Electoral Commission to set the necessary conditions for elections, with the active support of the international community. The Security Council welcomes the intention of international partners, including the European Union and the OSCE, to send electoral observation missions and support teams at the request of the Afghan Government. The Security Council stresses the importance of a secure environment for conducting elections, condemns those who resort to violence to obstruct the electoral process, and, while recognizing the ongoing efforts of the Afghan Government, encourages its additional efforts with the assistance of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to ensure security during the electoral period.

"The Security Council welcomes the strengthened commitment that the international community has shown recently in various fora, including those in Moscow, The Hague, Ankara, Strasbourg/Kehl, Washington, Islamabad, Tehran, Yekaterinburg and Trieste, to help the Afghan Government build a stable and prosperous Afghanistan well integrated in its region.

"The Security Council emphasizes the central role of UNAMA and the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in leading and coordinating the international civilian efforts in Afghanistan and notes the expectation expressed in the Hague Conference for expansion of UNAMA's presence. In this regard, the Security Council expresses its support for the Secretary-General's intention to further strengthen UNAMA this year and invites the Secretary-General to provide further details of his proposals.

"The Security Council welcomes the progress achieved by the Afghan Government on implementing the Afghan Compact and the Afghanistan National Development Strategy during the period covered by the latest report of the Secretary-General, encourages the Afghan Government to undertake enhanced efforts in addressing issues in the areas of security, governance, the rule of law and human rights, including gender equality, and economic and social development, as well as the cross-cutting

issue of counter-narcotics, and calls upon the international community to continue to support the Afghan Government's efforts, including provision of humanitarian assistance, in this regard. The Security Council recalls the priorities identified at the Paris Conference and reaffirmed at the Hague Conference, and emphasizes the importance of providing sufficient support needed for progress in these priority areas.

"The Security Council takes note of the status of the work of developing benchmarks for measuring and tracking progress in the implementation of UNAMA's mandate and priorities and expresses its hope that the work will be completed through consultation with all actors concerned and that finalized benchmarks will be included in the next report of the Secretary-General."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2009/21.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at noon.

United Nations S/PV.6163

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6163rd meeting

Thursday, 16 July 2009, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Rugunda	(Uganda)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Koudougou
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Guillermet
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. De Rivière
	Japan	Mr. Sumi
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Gouider
	Mexico	Mr. Heller
	Russian Federation	Mr. Shcherbak
	Turkey	Mr. Çorman
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Quarrey
	United States of America	Ms. DiCarlo
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

The situation in Sierra Leone

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-40569 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Sierra Leone

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Sierra Leone, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Davies (Sierra Leone) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the course of the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Justice Renate Winter, President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and to Mr. Steven Rapp, Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear briefings by Justice Renate Winter and Prosecutor Steven Rapp. I now give the floor to Justice Winter.

Ms. Winter: I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the Council for its decision to convene this important briefing on the Special Court for Sierra Leone. My presence before the Council today as President of the Special Court comes at a critical juncture in the final stages of the Court's mandate. Therefore, allow me to be direct and straightforward as I first provide a brief update on the status of our legal proceedings before discussing the Court's achievements and its impact on the citizens of Sierra Leone, as well as its residual issues and remaining challenges.

Over the past six years, the Prosecution has issued and the Chambers have confirmed indictments against 13 persons. Eleven individuals were arrested and transferred to the Special Court. Two died while in custody, one was killed in Liberia prior to being apprehended, and the whereabouts of another remain unknown. To date, we have concluded proceedings against eight of the remaining nine indictees in first instance.

The Special Court combined its proceedings into four main cases. Three of the trials took place in Freetown, against the leaders of the Civil Defence Forces (CDF), the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) and the Revolutionary United Front (RUF). The fourth trial — the prosecution of Charles Taylor, ex-President of the Republic of Liberia — is now being held in The Hague for security reasons.

The Special Court completed all three trials in Freetown, including the appeals proceedings in the CDF and AFRC cases. Those cases resulted in the conviction and sentencing of all five individuals. Currently, the Appeals Chamber is adjudicating the appeals in the RUF case, and it will deliver its judgement in October of this year. Upon delivery of the RUF appeals judgement, the Special Court will have completed all of the judicial proceedings conducted in Freetown. In our final trial, the Taylor trial, the prosecution closed its case in February this year, and the defence started the presentation of its evidence this week. As Council members may have seen on the news, Charles Taylor is currently on the witness stand, testifying in his own defence.

According to the updated completion strategy, the Special Court predicts that the trial judgement will be delivered in the Taylor case in July 2010 and the sentencing judgement, if necessary, one month later. We project that in February 2011, upon delivery of the appeals judgement in the Taylor case, we will have completed all of the Special Court's judicial activities.

It is not easy to fully predict the duration of trials. Judges sitting in a court of law have control over a court's proceedings but cannot violate the rights of the parties to be heard. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the Appeals Chamber has consistently adhered to the allocated time frame set out in the completion strategy. I am rather proud to mention that the Appeals Chamber

at the Special Court has never taken longer than five months to conclude any appeal. As such, let me reassure the Council of the Special Court's continued commitment to achieving the aforementioned milestones in a timely and thorough fashion.

For those reasons in particular, the Special Court is considered to be an exemplary model of international justice. Since its inception, it has achieved many firsts and set many precedents in the development of international criminal law. It handed down the first decision on the non-applicability of national amnesty for international prosecution. It first adjudicated the limitations of immunity of a head of State vis-à-vis an international criminal court, and it is the first court in history to establish as crimes against humanity the forcible recruitment and use of child soldiers, attacks against United Nations peacekeepers and the use of forced marriages, and to convict those responsible accordingly.

However, the Special Court's impact on Sierra Leone extends well beyond the findings in its cases. Through specific and sustained efforts, the Special Court has transferred expertise to Siena Leoneans via a number of programmes, including capacity-building and training on police investigations, case management, courtroom interpretation, archiving, witness protection and detention standards. Further, the passage into law of three gender bills by the Sierra Leone Parliament is a direct consequence of the Court's work on gender issues. All three laws will greatly improve the lives of women in Sierra Leone.

The Court's Outreach Section, known as its crown jewel, has made our legal proceedings a part of Sierra Leone's national discourse and heritage. Over the years, the Court has conducted over 10,000 events, including town hall meetings, radio programmes and training sessions at schools, villages and cities across Sierra Leone and throughout Liberia and Guinea, as well.

Additionally, the Special Court is assisting the Government of Siena Leone, wherever possible, in its efforts to ensure the sustainability of the Court site beyond the lifespan of the Court. Several potential uses of the site identified by the Government include, but are not limited to, a regional training centre for the rule of law and a memorial component for commemorating the victims of the war.

Though much has been accomplished, much still needs to be achieved. To maintain international standards and successfully fulfil its original mandate, the Special Court is still bound by a number of legal obligations that will not terminate after the completion of trials and appeals. Together with its Management Committee, the Special Court has thus worked to determine a suitable arrangement to provide for these obligations, known as residual issues. A small successor body, whose structure will be kept to a bare minimum, will likely need to be established to manage and perform such residual functions, including the enforcement of sentences, maintenance of the Special Court's archives, witness protection and assistance, and the possible trial or transfer of the case of the one indictee at large.

Although a stand-alone residual mechanism will have to be created in the short term, in the long term sharing an administrative stage with another institution should be considered, particularly as many of the residual functions that will be performed by the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia are similar to those of the Special Court. That would help to ensure the sustainability of the successor body in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

Assistance given by the Security Council will continue to be as important in the future as it has been in the past. Much of the Special Court's aforementioned success emerged from the generous support of the Security Council on numerous occasions. I would like to express particular gratitude for the Council's adoption of resolution 1688 (2006), which requested all States to cooperate in the transfer of Charles Taylor to the Netherlands; the adoption of resolution 1626 (2005), which extended the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) to include the protection of the Court's premises by a contingent of Mongolian troops; and the adoption of resolution 1750 (2007), mandating UNMIL to provide support to the Special Court for activities conducted in Liberia with the consent of the Liberian Government. Thus, in order to successfully complete its mandate in the coming months, the Special Court continues to rely on the indispensable support of the Security Council and all Member States. Today more than ever before, this request is urgent.

As members of the Council know, the Special Court is currently funded by voluntary contributions

from interested States. Despite efforts by the Court to contain costs and operate as efficiently as possible, the financial situation of the Court is most serious. In March 2009, the Secretary-General wrote to Member States to inform them of his grave concern regarding our funding situation and to seek their urgent support. Based on current available funds, the Court will experience a funding shortfall by the first week of August 2009 — a very short time from now. This shortfall poses the real possibility of disrupting our work, which would have disastrous consequences for the Council's extensive peacebuilding efforts in Sierra Leone and Liberia. A disruption in the proceedings would send the wrong message to the international community, jeopardizing the fight against impunity and potentially calling into question our collective commitment to international justice. In total, the Court will need approximately $30 million to complete its mandate successfully.

I would also like to recall that, in the words of resolution 1829 (2008), the Security Council recognizes that "further arrangements will be necessary to address residual matters". Because the necessary residual mechanisms must last as long as victims and witnesses need protection and until every sentence has been served, it will be a great and ongoing challenge to maintain the mechanism in the long term based purely on voluntary contributions. It is also important to note that fundraising has proven to be a time-consuming and costly endeavour.

There is much work to be accomplished over the next 18 months. Most importantly, we must conclude the final case in Sierra Leone, after which the facilities and operations in Freetown will be kept at a minimum provided that we can transfer in a timely manner the convicted persons to an enforcing State. To accomplish that endeavour and assist the host country, the establishment of a trust fund could be envisaged.

We must complete the trial of Charles Taylor in The Hague, which is so critical to preserving the fragile peace and stability in West Africa. Without the adequate funds, it will be very difficult to retain competent Court personnel who might depart for better-paid and longer-lasting employment, to the detriment of an efficiently run Trial Chamber. Lastly, the Special Court must set up a residual mechanism — the first of its kind — that will be of use to other international courts when they reach their final stages, thus saving significant costs to the international community.

The Special Court is an institution that the Council can be proud of. The Court's groundbreaking jurisprudence and its impact on the justice system in Sierra Leone are exemplary achievements. I am as confident as I am hopeful that the international community will allow our effective and competent Court to finalize its mandate successfully. To show that it is not only me who believes that the Special Court does effective and competent work, allow me to read out a letter that I received a few days ago:

> "In New York
>
> "Dear Gentlemen and Ladies:
>
> "Please accept this small donation to help with the work of your court. It is vitally important you keep up your important work. Thank you for your efforts and please continue to do your work. Thank you.
>
> "Enclosed is $20 to help. I know it is a small amount, but maybe if the world Governments do not fund your work, individuals will."

Is that not a nice letter? I will keep it with me, bring it to Sierra Leone, together with the $20-bill, and put it in a frame to show our people that they are not alone.

Let me conclude by once again expressing my gratitude to the Security Council and Member States for the support that the Special Court has received from the United Nations since its inception. On behalf of the judges and staff of the Special Court, I also wish to convey our utmost gratitude to the Management Committee of the Special Court, as well as to the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs for the invaluable help and advice it has imparted to the Special Court at all times.

The President: I thank Justice Winter for her briefing.

I now give the floor to Prosecutor Stephen Rapp.

Mr. Rapp: In beginning my presentation, let me echo the sentiments of President Winter and thank the Council for its decision to convene this briefing on the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

In resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council responded to a request that came from the Government

of Sierra Leone, and it also recognized the serious crimes committed against the people of that country, in requesting the Secretary-General to negotiate an agreement to create an independent special court. It was to be a credible system of justice and accountability that could hold individuals criminally responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law and, in doing so, contribute to the restoration and maintenance of peace.

For the victims — the thousands who had been mutilated, the tens of thousands who had been murdered, indeed the hundreds of thousands who had been subjected to sexual violence — the Special Court offers justice by holding to account those alleged to bear the greatest responsibility for these crimes.

As President Winter has reported, the Special Court has completed three multiple-accused trials in Freetown. Two of those cases have now been finalized on appeal, and the appeals proceeding in the third should be concluded by October 2009. Members will recall that the last time that the principals of the Special Court addressed this body, in June 2007 (see S/PV.5690), we reported that the fourth trial had just commenced with the presentation of the prosecution's opening statement. That was the trial of Charles Taylor, the former President of Liberia.

Since then, some 91 individuals, almost all of them from Sierra Leone or Liberia, have travelled to and from The Hague to present their testimony. They were able personally to bear witness in this historic proceeding because their presence in the Netherlands was made possible by the Security Council in resolution 1688 (2006), which facilitated the conduct of this trial away from the seat of the Special Court in the interests of regional security.

Since the witnesses began their testimonies in January 2008, the Taylor trial has proceeded smoothly, with a high level of transparency, efficiency and fairness. This very week saw the commencement of the defence case, with the presentation of its opening statement, followed by the accused himself, former President Taylor, taking the stand to begin his testimony. Thereafter, other defence witnesses will testify, and the accused will be assured of his right to fully contest the indictment against him. We feel confident that the trial will be conducted and managed to allow for the entry of judgement by mid-2010 and for finalization on appeal by very early in 2011.

As President Winter has mentioned, the proceedings in Freetown have resulted in historic developments in international humanitarian law. Most well known was the groundbreaking precedent recognizing that the use of child soldiers — persons under the age of 15 — in armed conflict was an international crime, followed thereafter by the convictions — the first in history — of five individual defendants for that offence. The Special Court also pronounced the first-ever conviction on the charge of acts of terrorism in a non-international armed conflict. The recent trial judgement in the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) case included the first convictions in history for the specific crime of attacks on United Nations peacekeepers. This was an offence that was defined in the 1994 Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. This precedent sends a clear message in the conflict zones around the world, wherever the United Nations, through its Member States, has provided and today is providing forces to maintain peace and security.

The Special Court continues to make a significant contribution to bringing justice to victims of sexual violence and gender-based crimes, of which there were so many during the Sierra Leone civil war. The Court pronounced the first-ever convictions on the charge of sexual slavery, both as a war crime and as a crime against humanity. It further recognized forced marriage as an inhumane act constituting a crime against humanity and rendered in February the first convictions on that charge.

In pursuing this wider range of offences, and by alleging that they were among the acts of terrorism, the prosecution was able to present a case showing that these acts of sexual violence were committed as part of a strategy for dominating and instilling fear in the civilian population. In the recent RUF trial judgement, again for the first time, leaders of an armed movement were held responsible for these offences, whatever their physical distance from the actual acts, because the commission of these crimes was part of a common scheme or plan.

The Court's work has helped implement Security Council resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008), which recognized that the protection of women and girls in armed conflict can significantly contribute to international peace and security, called on parties to protect them from gender-based violence and

emphasized the shared responsibility to end impunity and prosecute those responsible for such crimes.

All of these accomplishments have been achieved by the Special Court for Sierra Leone, an institution that represents a partnership between an African nation and the international community. It is a court in which 60 per cent of the workforce is Sierra Leonean, and in which Sierra Leone citizens hold senior positions in every organ, including my own Deputy Prosecutor, Joseph Kamara. It is also the court that has placed the highest priority on outreach, in providing accurate information about its proceedings to the population throughout Sierra Leone, and, for the Taylor case, to Liberia as well. For as important as it is to do justice, for all those that the Court intends to serve it is also important that justice be seen to be done.

As the Special Court concludes its proceedings, we must address the need for a mechanism to deal with residual issues. President Winter mentioned several of these issues. Let me focus on one that falls directly within the responsibility of the prosecution.

This concerns the case of the Court's one indictee-at-large, Johnny Paul Koroma. Witnesses in the Taylor trial have testified to hearing reports that Koroma was killed in Liberia not long after he was indicted. However, despite significant efforts, the prosecution has not been able to find and identify his remains, and rumours persist of his whereabouts in the subregion. Mr. Koroma was head of the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) and served as the effective chief of State during the nine months in 1997 and 1998 that an AFRC-RUF junta ruled in Sierra Leone. Three other leaders of the AFRC have been tried and convicted. It would be unacceptable for the country and for international justice were Koroma to surface after the closure of the Court and never have to answer for his alleged crimes in a court of law. Therefore, the prosecution has been in discussions with authorities in Sierra Leone and two other States and will take steps before the Special Court concludes its active proceedings to ensure that Koroma can be prosecuted thereafter within a national system.

President Winter spoke of the need for State cooperation in the enforcement of our sentences. It is well accepted that the prison sentences of the Court's convicted persons must be served in facilities that are secure and that meet international standards. The Government of Sierra Leone expressed its wish that these sentences be served outside of Sierra Leone. We in the prosecution share that view because of our concern for the safety and the security of the witnesses and also for the personnel of the Special Court. It is therefore necessary to reach agreements with States for enforcement of sentences that provide that the enforcing State will cover the cost of caring for the prisoners, or to provide funding through the residual mechanism to meet these expenses on an ongoing basis.

Those are but two of the challenges that must be met during the post-closure period. The Court and its Management Committee are working on proposals for a very small residual mechanism that may provide a model for the other international courts that will close after us. However, even if it is very small, we will still need a secure source of funding that will remain in place until all prisoners have served their sentences and all the challenges have been managed.

While the future funding of the residual mechanism must be addressed, the Court's immediate financial situation may now be fairly characterized as an impending crisis. Even if all pledged donations from donors for this year come in early — and that is as yet uncertain, as the President told the Council — at the moment, the funds on hand will be exhausted in August. If those contributions come in early this year, our funds will nonetheless run dry early next year, before the next round of donations. The Special Court will not have the resources necessary to complete its work.

We are deeply appreciative of the support of Member States that have provided the voluntary contributions that have permitted the Special Court to reach this point, when its mission is so close to completion. We all wish to express our profound gratitude to the Secretary-General for his letters to Member States on our behalf, most recently on 16 March 2009. At this point, while we recognize that the Security Council is not directly involved in financial issues, we would respectfully request the Council and its President to consider urging Member States to pledge and to contribute so that the Special Court can conclude the RUF appeal in Freetown and the historic proceedings in the Charles Taylor case in The Hague.

The commission of serious crimes against the civilian population of Sierra Leone motivated the

creation of the Special Court. We ask for the cooperation and support necessary to complete its mandate, so that justice can be achieved for the victims of those crimes. As envisioned by the Security Council in resolution 1315 (2000), that will contribute to reconciliation and respect for the rule of law. It will also send a powerful message that the international community strongly supports institutions established to hold to account those responsible for such atrocities, and by doing so deter their perpetration in the future, thus saving others from the violence, the injury, and the death visited on the innocent people of Sierra Leone.

The President: I thank Prosecutor Rapp for his briefing. I shall now give the floor to members of the Council who wish to make statements.

Mr. Quarrey (United Kingdom): I should like to start by thanking the President and the Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone for their very informative briefings this morning and for all the work they are doing to help to bring justice to the people of Sierra Leone. We would also like to welcome to the Council today the representative of Sierra Leone.

Since we last considered the work of the Special Court, Sierra Leone has made significant progress. Its elections in September 2007 were another milestone for the country. They demonstrated that, in spite of a decade of conflict, Sierra Leone is beginning to consolidate its peace and rebuild its democratic institutions and tradition. Part of that consolidation has been the re-establishment of the rule of law and the repudiation of impunity. The Special Court has played a central role in that process.

The United Kingdom is a strong supporter of the Special Court, as we are a friend to Sierra Leone. We have demonstrated that support through practical and concrete actions. We are one of the largest financial contributors to the Special Court, having contributed some $32 million to the Court's operations since 2002. We are also an active member of the Special Court's Management Committee here in New York.

The Court is now entering the final stages of its work. It is significant that the Security Council is considering the work of the Court in the same week that the defence case begins in the trial of Charles Taylor. He is the first African head of State to be tried for war crimes. He is also the last of the indictees to be brought before the Court. We are confident that Mr. Taylor will receive a fair trial in accordance with internationally recognized human rights norms. We stand ready to imprison Mr. Taylor in the United Kingdom if he is convicted.

It is because the Court is entering the final stages of its work that, as President Winter has said, we must urgently address the Court's legacy and residual issues. Like the Court itself, the proposed residual mechanism is slimmed down and cost-efficient. Supporters of the Court will need to consider how that mechanism is funded, how it may fit with the follow-on mechanisms of other international tribunals and how it offers the international community both the best service, in terms of international jurisprudence, and value for money. It is critical to the integrity of the justice process to date that residual functions be sustained effectively.

It remains important that, even in these final stages, the Court continues to work to fulfil its mandate as expeditiously as possible and, where possible, deliver further efficiencies and budgetary savings. Equally, it is essential that the international community ensure that the Special Court has the resources it needs to complete its valuable work. We have heard today of the impending crisis in the Court's finances. We would strongly urge all Member States to make the further financial contributions needed to fund the final chapter of the Court's operations. We are grateful to those States that are working with the Court on the issue of enforcement of sentences and witness relocation.

Finally, we should like to pledge our support for the continued work of the Court, which has played an indispensible role in helping to bring sustainable peace to Sierra Leone. We pay tribute to its President, Prosecutor, judges and all its staff.

Mr. Çorman (Turkey): I would like to welcome Justice Renate Winter, President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and Prosecutor Stephen Rapp, as well as to thank them for their comprehensive briefings. I also wish to thank you, Mr. President, for convening this very timely meeting, which is taking place at a time when defence hearings are under way in The Hague in the case of former Liberian President Charles Taylor. That case represents one of the most significant undertakings of the Court. It is therefore of great use for the Council to be kept abreast of the work of the Special Court.

Sierra Leone went through perilous times in the 1990s. It is now a great pleasure to see that war-torn

country emerge from that difficult period with promising signs of peace and stability. For that, we commend the people and political leadership of the country for showing resilience and taking bold steps towards unity and reconciliation. That said, we also highly appreciate the important role of the Special Court in its efforts to end impunity and advance the rule of law in Sierra Leone.

Indeed, since its establishment the Special Court has done impressive work to that end, contributing not only to national peace and harmony but also to regional stability and understanding. In that regard, we agree with President Winter that the Special Court for Sierra Leone is an exemplary model of international justice. As she pointed out, the firsts and precedents established by the Court in the development of international criminal law are all worth emphasizing.

In more specific terms, I would also like to congratulate the Special Court on its significant achievements in 2008, such as the completion of two out of four trials, namely, the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council and the Civil Defence Forces cases. We hope that the Revolutionary United Front case will also be concluded soon through the appeals judgement. Given the significance of the case related to former Liberian President Charles Taylor, we think that the continuation of the valuable work of the Special Court may now be even more important than ever, for the trial of Charles Taylor, which has attracted worldwide attention, will be a turning point in international efforts to end impunity.

In fact, a fair and effective trial process in each of the four cases dealt with by the Special Court will send a clear message to everyone involved and will, we hope, discourage war crimes and crimes against humanity all around the world. After all, those who perpetrate such crimes must know that they will be held responsible by the international community for their acts.

We believe that the Special Court for Sierra Leone will successfully complete its work within the time frame described by the President and the Prosecutor of the Court. For us, the successful completion of the work is more important that merely meeting deadlines. We therefore think that we should be flexible in allowing the time needed by the Court, taking into account the requirements of the tasks at hand. Moreover, the effective completion of the Court's work also depends upon the availability of the necessary resources. In this regard, the continued contribution of the international community should also be seen as an essential element of the completion strategy. For its part, Turkey has consistently made voluntary financial contributions to the Special Court since its inception.

Finally, the Special Court for Sierra Leone will constitute yet another first by being the first international court to set up a residual mechanism. This is also worth noting when we speak about the completion strategy. We believe that this residual mechanism can constitute an example that could be emulated by other international courts as well.

In conclusion, we thank the President and the Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone for their most valuable work and wish them every success in their future deliberations.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): Allow me to begin by welcoming and extending our gratitude to the President and the Prosecutor of the Special Court for sharing with the Security Council the latest information on the considerable progress made in implementing the Court's mandate. We appreciate their personal commitment in carrying out this mandate.

The Court's establishment, which broke new ground in international criminal justice, and its jurisprudence and accomplishments represent a strong contribution to the global fight against impunity and the fostering of the rule of law. It continues to demonstrate that peace and justice are not contradictory terms.

Earlier this year, a significant milestone was achieved with the conviction of Revolutionary United Front leaders for atrocities committed during the civil war in Sierra Leone, sending a strong message against impunity for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

Croatia continues to closely follow the trial of Charles Taylor in The Hague. We appreciate the extensive outreach efforts undertaken by the Court. Together with its capacity-building projects, these efforts represent an excellent way of not only spreading awareness and understanding of the Court's mission, but also preserving its legacy and thus contributing to lasting peace and stability in Sierra Leone and in the region of West Africa.

As the operations in Freetown are nearing conclusion, we understand that certain challenges remain. Funding remains a critical issue for the Court in this phase. One of the pressing outstanding questions is securing the appropriate arrangements and financing for the enforcement of sentences, and we welcome the steps taken by the Court and its Management Committee to address these issues.

We also understand that continuing international support is indispensable to achieving the orderly completion of the Court's work, which in turn will be the best guarantee for securing its lasting legacy. As an ad hoc institution, the Special Court will once again break new ground in the field of international justice by having to provide solutions to support its residual functions while respecting international standards in ensuring the ongoing protection of the human rights of individuals affected by its work. We support the Court's efforts to that end.

Croatia has highly appreciated the opportunity to consult with the representatives of the Special Court in the context of the ongoing discussions within the Security Council's informal working group on international tribunals, which is currently examining options for setting up residual mechanisms for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. Croatia hopes to see the continuation of this exchange, which could certainly be of mutual interest and benefit for both sides.

Mr. Mayr-Harting (Austria): At the outset, I would like to thank the President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, Justice Renate Winter, and its Prosecutor, Mr. Stephen Rapp, for their very informative briefings. Allow me to add that we are honoured that an Austrian national, who previously distinguished herself as an international judge in Kosovo, is presiding over that important Court.

Austria has a long-standing commitment to support and contribute to efforts to strengthen the rule of law, promote human rights and end impunity for the perpetrators of the most serious crimes. My delegation thus highly commends the efforts of the Special Court to bring to justice those responsible for the crimes committed during the armed conflict in Sierra Leone since 1991, including former Liberian President Charles Taylor, who was arrested in the spring of 2006.

The Court's work is vital to ensuring accountability and promoting reconciliation, peacebuilding and the re-establishment of the rule of law in Sierra Leone. The Special Court plays a pioneering role in combating impunity and strengthening the rule of law at both the international and the national levels. As the President and the Prosecutor have already pointed out, judgements delivered by the Court have greatly contributed to the development of international criminal law and international humanitarian law, in particular regarding the recruitment and use of child soldiers and forced marriages. As the Prosecutor has said, it is important to note that lawyers from Sierra Leone have played a very important part in these developments.

At the national level, the activities of the Court, including through its capacity-building and outreach programmes, have assisted in strengthening the justice system in Sierra Leone. Further efforts in this field are, however, needed.

As was highlighted by President Winter today, the Special Court also faces a number of important challenges. First and foremost, the very serious financial situation of the Court is of great concern. As is well known, the Special Court is funded exclusively by voluntary contributions, and currently available funds, as has been said, will be exhausted by early August. We join in President Winter's urgent call upon all States to help alleviate the dire financial situation of the Court. The Austrian Government has made repeated voluntary contributions to the Court, most recently following the appeal of the Secretary-General in March.

Secondly, the Court is doing its utmost to accomplish its completion strategy and finish its work, including the Taylor case, at the earliest date, while maintaining all standards of fair trial and due process, as well as undertaking effective outreach among the local population in the region. Austria fully supports these efforts and appreciates the projections that all of the Court's judicial activities will be complete by February 2011.

Finally, we must bear in mind that the work of the Special Court will not be finished at the time of the completion of the last case, but that a number of residual functions, as has been said, will have to be performed even after its closure. As chair of the Security Council's informal working group on

international tribunals, which deals with the residual issues of the ad hoc Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, Austria follows very closely the ongoing discussions in the Special Court and its Management Committee on setting up a small successor body to manage and perform such residual functions, including the enforcement of sentences, the maintenance of archives, witness protection and the possible trial or transfer of the case of Johnny Koroma, who is still at large.

In this context, Austria also supports the proposal to establish a trust fund to cover the costs for the upkeep of prisoners of the Special Court so that they can serve their sentences in appropriate enforcing States. Despite a number of legal and practical differences between the Special Court for Sierra Leone and the two ad hoc Tribunals, in essence we are facing the same challenge — closing down an international criminal tribunal, which, as some have said, seems to be a much more complex task than setting up a new tribunal. We stand ready to further intensify the informal dialogue and exchange of views between the members of the working group and the Special Court and its Management Committee.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the President, judges, Prosecutor, Registrar and all of the staff of the Special Court for their tireless efforts in the name of international justice, and to reaffirm Austria's continued cooperation and support for the Special Court.

Ms. DiCarlo (United States of America): I would like to welcome Justice Renate Winter, President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and Stephen Rapp, Prosecutor of the Court, to the Council today and thank them for their briefings. My Government would like to congratulate them on the significant achievements of the Court to date. I would also like to welcome the representative of Sierra Leone to the Council.

Today's briefings come at a critical juncture as the Court completes the final phase of its mandate. The successful completion of the Court's work and the establishment of a viable residual mechanism remain priorities for the United States.

The United States was instrumental in the establishment of the Special Court for Sierra Leone and has been its largest financial supporter. Since the Court's inception in 2002, the United States has contributed more than $60 million to it. We welcome the broad financial support that the Court has enjoyed in the past, and we encourage all Member States to support the Court to help ensure that justice is served, impunity is not tolerated and Sierra Leone and the region can sustain accountability, peace and security in the years to come. The Court must be supported if it is to conclude its mandate.

The Government of Sierra Leone has been a strong and committed partner in the work of the Court. The Court has been instrumental in contributing to peace and stability in Sierra Leone through the creation of a transparent and independent judicial process. When the Court closes, it will effectively end a chapter in Sierra Leonean history.

The United States fully supports the Court's efforts to transfer its institutional knowledge to Sierra Leone authorities. We believe it important to the country's ongoing democratic development that all lessons of the past be fully absorbed, and the Special Court has much to offer in that regard. After the Court's mandate is completed, the international community will, of course, continue its efforts to support peacebuilding and long-term social and economic development in Sierra Leone.

The United States has appreciated the opportunity to serve on the Special Court's Management Committee. We commend the work of the Canadian Chair. We also commend the work of the Court's staff in evaluating options for a residual mechanism, and we applaud their efforts to reduce cost and improve efficiency in the Court's operations. The United States remains committed to an efficient, cost-effective and successful residual mechanism.

Finally, we again thank the President, the Prosecutor, the Acting Registrar and their staff for their dedication and commitment. The Court has broken new ground in the field of international criminal law, including the recognition of the use of child soldiers as an international crime and sexual slavery as a war crime and crime against humanity. And it has built a powerful legacy by fighting against impunity and working to bring justice to the people of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Hoang Chi Trung (Viet Nam): My delegation wishes to sincerely thank Justice Renate Winter, President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and Prosecutor Stephen Rapp for their briefings to the Council on the activities of the Special Court, in particular the implementation of its completion

strategy. The Vietnamese delegation also welcomes the presence of the representative of Sierra Leone at our meeting today.

Viet Nam has been following closely and with satisfaction the continued achievements of the Government of Sierra Leone in the implementation of its agenda for peace consolidation and economic recovery. Those achievements were recognized in the sixth report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (S/2008/281). In that context, the establishment and operation of the Special Court for Sierra Leone have proved to be positive contributions to the development of peace and security in the country.

We would like to take this opportunity to commend the Special Court for its completed and ongoing trials, as well as for the important precedents that the Court has set in international criminal law. We are following with keen interest the formulation and implementation of the Special Court's completion strategy, including the establishment of a residual mechanism. These will serve as helpful guidelines to the members of the Security Council in their consideration of similar issues relating to the two other international criminal Tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda.

Mr. Shcherbak (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): On behalf of the delegation of the Russian Federation, I should like to thank the leadership of the Special Court for today's briefings and to note the considerable contributions made by that institution to the fight against impunity. We also welcome the presence of the representative of Sierra Leone at today's meeting.

Since its establishment, the Special Court has carried out serious work aimed at prosecuting individuals who have committed serious violations of international humanitarian law. It has accumulated valuable and, in certain respects, unique experience in the area of international criminal justice. The Court has demonstrated its effectiveness despite the financial difficulties facing it.

Of equal importance are the Special Court's contributions to strengthening stability in Sierra Leone and throughout the subregion. Critical tasks in that regard include assisting the country's State institutions, particularly in the area of security and justice, and resolving problems related to the reintegration of ex-combatants into peaceful life.

The Special Court's activities have shown that justice and reconciliation in post-conflict societies need not conflict with each other, but rather that they can be complementary elements in the peacebuilding process. We welcome the momentum in the Court's proceedings as we approach the deadline for the completion of its work. Two major cases have been fully considered thus far, which will make it possible to focus on the remaining trials. The most complex and politically sensitive of these is generally recognized to be the trial of Mr. Charles Taylor, former President of Liberia. We are closely following the developments in that regard.

We note the progress made by the Special Court regarding its future residual mechanism, which we believe will be a compact and cost-effective temporary structure.

In conclusion, we note the Special Court's considerable achievements in the area of public outreach regarding its activities, as well as its efforts to build the judicial and law-enforcement capacities of Sierra Leone. In our view, the projects undertaken by the Special Court in that area, if successfully implemented, will become an important part of the Special Court's future legacy.

Mr. Koudougou (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): I should like at the outset to thank Justice Renate Winter and Mr. Stephen Rapp, President and Prosecutor, respectively, of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, for the very useful information that they have shared with us on the Court's judicial activities and its completion strategy. We also welcome the presence among us of the representative of Sierra Leone.

Established to shed light on all crimes, atrocities and other human rights violations and thus to combat impunity in a country ravaged by several years of civil war, the Special Court has succeeded in integrating itself into the Sierra Leonean institutional landscape and in making a major contribution to the reconciliation and reconstruction process and to the establishment of a lasting peace in that country. That is why, like previous speakers, I should like to congratulate the Court on the results achieved, despite the difficulties of every kind — particularly financial — that it has had to face. We take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Government and the people of Sierra

Leone for their cooperation with the Court, without which those results would never have been achieved. We welcome the cooperation shown by the States of West Africa, and we are also grateful to those countries and institutions that have provided the financial support essential to the Court's functioning.

On the political front, we note that Sierra Leone has made notable progress thanks to the firm resolve of its people; to subregional support, in particular from the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS); and to significant support from the entire international community, all of which have contributed to Sierra Leone's admission to the Peacebuilding Commission.

As a State member of ECOWAS, Burkina Faso believes in the possibility of lasting stability in that country. We call on the international community to continue to support the Special Court, in particular in implementing its completion strategy.

Mr. Sumi (Japan): I, too, wish to thank President Renate Winter and Prosecutor Stephen Rapp of the Special Court for Sierra Leone for their informative briefings. Their briefings to the Security Council are very timely in view of the commencement on 13 July of the defence case in the trial of Charles Taylor and of the progress made in the other cases since the most recent briefings in 2007. I also welcome the presence of the representative of Sierra Leone in the Council today.

Japan is strongly committed to the realization of justice and the rule of law at both the national and the international levels, and believes that international and hybrid criminal tribunals have played an important role to that end. We have therefore been making the utmost effort to contribute to the activities of the various criminal tribunals.

I take this opportunity to reaffirm Japan's strong support for the activities of the Special Court for Sierra Leone. The Special Court was established in a country where serious crimes had been committed. Although the case of former President Charles Taylor had to be conducted in The Hague for several reasons, the closeness of the Special Court to the people of Sierra Leone and its effective outreach programmes have contributed to gaining the understanding and acceptance of the affected people. This unique feature of the Special Court is noteworthy and provides important lessons for future trials for serious crimes committed in conflict situations.

Japan highly appreciates the efforts made by the judges, prosecutors and registrars, who have contributed greatly to the significant progress made so far. We also appreciate the tireless efforts of the Management Committee chaired by Canada, which has been addressing a number of difficulties faced by the Special Court. Japan strongly hopes that, through the continued efforts of the Special Court and the contributing States, the Court will be able to overcome the current financial challenges and successfully complete its mandate.

The Special Court for Sierra Leone has played a pioneering role in addressing unprecedented legal and practical challenges. The issue regarding the residual functions of the ad hoc tribunals after the completion of trials is another unprecedented challenge that the Special Court must address before the other international tribunals. Although there are important differences between the Special Court and the other tribunals, Japan hopes that the experience of the Special Court for Sierra Leone will offer useful insights on that issue for the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and other tribunals.

Mr. Heller (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): Mexico, like other members, thanks President Renate Winter and Prosecutor Stephen Rapp of the Special Court for Sierra Leone for the detailed information they have provided to the Council on the work of the Special Court, its successes and the challenges ahead. We also welcome the presence of the representative of Sierra Leone in the Council.

The Special Court for Sierra Leone is a pioneer and exemplar in the field of international criminal justice. It has made significant contributions to the development of international jurisprudence and made decisions of great importance to the international community. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that the most important work of the Court has been the extremely positive effect its work has had on the people in Sierra Leone, first because it showed the population that the worst violations of international humanitarian law of which they were victims throughout most of the previous decade will not go unpunished. It also reconfirmed the theory that, if

peace and reconciliation are to be achieved, they must be accompanied by justice.

Secondly, the Court has done essential work at the national level and, we hope, beyond its borders to build a culture of dissuasion and prevention of the most serious crimes, and to strengthen institutional capacity in Sierra Leone based on a criminal justice system in conformity with international standards. In brief, the work of the Special Court for Sierra Leone has made a decisive contribution to the transition to peace and the rule of law and has been critical to ongoing efforts to ensure national reconciliation and reconstruction.

My delegation listened closely to the information provided to the Council on the completion of all the Court's legal proceedings in Freetown by October. We are also following the trial of the former President of Liberia, Charles Taylor, in The Hague. On the latter point, of particular importance is the enormous contribution, for which we are extremely grateful, made by the Special Court for Sierra Leone to the development of international justice by setting limits on the immunity of a head of State before an international court.

President Winter also gave us estimates contained in the completion strategy recently adopted by the Management Committee of the Special Court for the conclusion of the Court's legal activities. She also identified some of the challenges the Court will face in carrying out its residual functions, such as the management of archives, the protection of witnesses, and the execution of sentences, among others. Without a doubt, those functions and tasks must be supported by the international community.

At the same time, my delegation has taken due note of the urgent needs facing the Special Court, in particular with regard to financing its activities. Mexico has supported the work of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, in particular in the light of its results. In most recent years, my country has made a modest contribution to financing the work of the Court. That was the result of an enormous effort on the part of the Mexican Government, but it was done in the conviction that it is important to combat impunity with regard to the commission of the most serious crimes against humanity.

Once again, Mexico thanks President Winter and Prosecutor Rapp for their timely appearance before the Council and assures them that it will continue to follow developments in the work of the Court with great interest.

Ms. Chen Peijie (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the outset, I would like to thank President Winter and Prosecutor Rapp of the Special Court for Sierra Leone for their briefings. We also welcome the presence at this meeting of the representative of Sierra Leone.

We have taken note of the fact that over the past two years the Special Court has continued to make progress in its work, including the finalization of two trials. That means that only two trials remain to be completed. We express our appreciation for that progress. As the trials and appeals approach completion, the goals set in the Special Court's completion strategy are coming into sight. We are pleased to note that the Special Court's judicial activities could conclude in early 2011. We look forward to that.

China has always supported the work of the Special Court. We anticipate that the Court will continue effectively its work on both trials and appeals, that it will successfully address legacy issues in an appropriate and effective manner and that it will achieve the goals set out in its completion strategy in an appropriate and timely way. We hope that countries in a position to do so will continue to support the Special Court in order to help it to overcome the difficulties it faces and assist it to effectively carry out its completion strategy.

Mr. Gouider (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I join previous speakers in expressing our appreciation to Justice Renate Winter, President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and to Mr. Stephen Rapp, Prosecutor of the Special Court. I also welcome the presence among us of the representative of Sierra Leone.

We thank the Special Court for Sierra Leone for its endeavours, as described today by its President and its Prosecutor, whom we thank for their briefings and for the exceptional work they, the other judges and the Court staff have done. There is no doubt that history will record their role in enriching international criminal and humanitarian law in a number of important ways.

Like those given yesterday to the Security Council Committee on Sierra Leone, today's briefings outlined the Court's activities, which indicate that there has been palpable progress towards fulfilling the

completion strategy in keeping with the principles of due process, fairness and respect for the rights of indictees. We support measures adopted by the Court and its Management Committee, in particular those adopted so far this year. Such measures include amending the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, providing support to Court staff and updating the timeline for trials and appeals.

In the light of the briefings and the Secretary-General's letters, we believe that in spite of that progress it is important for States in a position to do so to take concrete measures to provide financial and human-resources support for the Court. That is a matter of urgency given the Court's current difficult financial situation.

We attach high value to the Court President's comments on the Court's relationship with the Sierra Leone judicial and legal system, and on its impact on that system. In discussing ad hoc courts, my country has always advocated building national judicial capacity. We reaffirm that today with a view to enabling national judicial bodies to continue the proceedings of all ad hoc courts when those courts have completed their work, with full commitment to the principles of due process and fair trials. That would guarantee respect for the principle of equality and would entrench the rule of law in the States concerned. It would also ensure State ownership of court archives, whose importance transcends the actual proceedings and involves the history of the States concerned and the process of national reconciliation. The situation has changed, and the national judiciaries of States in which such crimes have been committed and where evidence and witnesses are available are capable of professionally handling all unresolved issues, with the support and assistance of the international community.

Our concern that the Special Court for Sierra Leone complete its work in line with the completion strategy — a concern shared by the Court — places upon us the responsibility to enable the Court to decide as soon as possible on measures with respect to legacy issues, through a mechanism with defined tasks and resources.

Mr. De Rivière (France) (*spoke in French*): I too wish to thank Ms. Renate Winter, President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and Mr. Stephen Rapp, Prosecutor of the Court, for their work. The gravity of the crimes perpetrated during the civil war called for a response commensurate with the violence. It was a matter of fighting impunity for those who committed those serious violations of international humanitarian law. That is why, since the Court's establishment in 2002, France has provided full political support for the activities of this criminal court established jointly by the Government of Sierra Leone and the United Nations.

In that respect the trial of Charles Taylor is a good example, because it is the first trial of a sitting head of State indicted by an international judicial body. His trial, which has just entered the defence phase, is being followed fervently not only in Sierra Leone but also, and especially, in Liberia. That illustrates the sometimes tragic interweaving of the history of those two countries and the fragility that persists, particularly in Liberia — a fragility that can be addressed only by Liberians themselves.

In that context, it is noteworthy that the United Nations has succeeded in adopting an approach with a regional orientation: in Sierra Leone, the Special Court is guarded by a contingent from the United Nations Mission in Liberia. That should encourage us to continue on that path, including the transformation of the United Nations presence in Sierra Leone into an integrated office, linked with the inclusive approach advocated within the Sierra Leone country-specific configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission.

From today's briefings, I understand that the Special Court for Sierra Leone will complete its work by 2011 at the latest. The Council should therefore express itself on the Court's completion strategy soon. In that regard, France hopes that the final strategy will be financially sustainable. The Sierra Leone court system should be closely associated with this and should play its full part in taking over residual functions; likewise, other countries could provide support so that those convicted by the Special Court can serve their sentences on the territory of those countries.

Mr. Guillermet (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to start by thanking Renate Winter, President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and Prosecutor Steven Rapp for their presence among us and for their briefings. This Council and the international community must be proud of the work of and the trail blazed by the Special Court for Sierra Leone.

The Special Court has been a bellwether. It was the first Court to be established with a shared model of responsibilities under an agreement between the United Nations and one of its Member States — Sierra Leone. Primarily, however, it was the first step taken by that country in its fight against impunity and accountability for serious crimes whose excessive cruelty shocked humankind.

As Justice Winter eloquently described, the Special Court for Sierra Leone has set precedents in many matters. Its jurisprudence was the first to develop the principle of non-applicability of amnesties in international prosecution and to establish limitations on the immunity of heads of State before an international criminal court, and it was the first to recognize the use of child soldiers as an international crime. Its invaluable legacy to international criminal justice and to international law deserves our acknowledgement and the praise of the international community.

Now, it is to be the first to end its judicial proceedings and to set up a residual mechanism that will remain once it has closed its doors. It will serve as an example for other courts. In that regard, we acknowledge the need to redouble the international community's efforts towards completion and to ensure justice for the victims.

The last trial, which has been pending since October, is that of the former President of Liberia, Charles Taylor, which is a clear example that the arm of the law reaches the highest political leaders, guaranteeing their right to a legitimate defence with internationally recognized procedural guarantees.

My delegation fully agrees that the conclusion of the trial of Charles Taylor is essential to making peace and stability sustainable in West Africa. The work of the Court proves to this Council that the contradiction between peace and justice that is sometimes posited is non-existent. The achievements of the Special Court for Sierra Leone show us that peace and justice are not incompatible, but that, on the contrary, justice is a decisive factor in ensuring sustainable and lasting peace.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Uganda.

I wish to join other members of the Council in welcoming Justice Renate Winter, President of the Special Court for Sierra Leone, and Steven Rapp, Prosecutor of the Special Court, and I thank them for their briefings. I would also like to welcome the representative of Sierra Leone to this meeting.

Uganda appreciates the tremendous work carried out by the Court over the past six years. We attach great importance to the delivery of justice and to the fight against impunity for persons who bear the greatest responsibility for heinous crimes and violations of international humanitarian law. Uganda applauds the President, the Prosecutor and the Court on the completion strategy and on the timely manner in which they plan to complete the cases before the Court. To that extent, the Court can rightly claim the accolades it has received for being an exemplary model for international criminal justice.

We note, however, the challenge of the residual issues, which also concerns other interim tribunals. It is imperative that those issues be dealt with properly and ensure the smooth conclusion of the work of the tribunal. Uganda welcomes the capacity-building programmes and the training extended to the Sierra Leone police on investigations. In that way, the Court ensures that, even when its mandate is over, there will be continuity. There is no substitute for programmes such as victim and witness protection until the last sentence has been served.

We also welcome the outreach programmes, which ensure that the victims and the community are informed at every stage of the process. Only thus will they develop confidence that the system works, so that the healing process can start in full awareness that their abusers were punished for their transgressions. Justice must not only be done — it must also be seen to be done. The Special Court's outreach programmes reinforce that long-held legal adage.

We have noted with concern that, based on current available funds, the Court will experience a significant shortfall by the beginning of next month, which is likely to disrupt its work. It is important that the resources of the Court be predictable and consistent in order to enable the Court to concentrate on its judicial work and not to be encumbered by engaging in fund-raising activities. We therefore appeal to the international partners to urgently provide the requisite funds to the Court and thank the international partners for the exemplary efforts that they have made in mobilizing the resources that have supported the Courts to date.

Finally, I thank the President, the Prosecutor and the staff of the Special Court for their good work.

I resume my functions as President of the Council.

I now give the floor to the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Davies (Sierra Leone): I want to thank the Council for organizing this meeting and the President and the Prosecutor of the Special Court for Sierra Leone for briefing the Council on the considerable achievements that the Court has made.

As already highlighted by previous speakers, we have come a long way since the cessation of hostilities. We have been able to successfully organize three elections, the last of which brought a change of Government that saw the former opposition party leader, President Ernest Bai Koroma of the All People's Congress, form the present Government.

Sierra Leone has had a unique experience in its peacebuilding process. Being maybe the first country to introduce a hybrid Special Court and a Truth and Reconciliation Commission in which perpetrators of atrocities and victims were able to expel the venom in them, whilst those responsible for serious atrocities were brought to justice in the Special Court.

I want to use this opportunity to thank the members of the international community who have consistently supported the Court, both financially and morally, and to appeal for their continued support with a view to concluding the Court's valuable work until it completes its deliberations early in 2011. We note with satisfaction that two trials have already been completed, with two remaining trials to be concluded.

Let me once again thank the Council for this meeting and President Winter and Prosecutor Rapp for their lucid presentations.

The President: I now give the floor to Justice Winter to respond to comments.

Ms. Winter: I do not wish to take up much of the Council's time. We have had a meeting of great importance, especially to the Special Court for Sierra Leone. Once again, I would like to express my gratitude in the name of the Court and thank the Council for the continuous help that we have received so far. I urge the Council not to forget all those victims and witnesses who risked so much to come forward and help justice to achieve its cause. I urge the Council not to forget us now in our final efforts to complete our work. I thank all its members very much.

The President: I shall now give the floor to Mr. Rapp to respond to some of the comments that have been made.

Mr. Rapp: I wish to join President Winter in thanking the Council for convening this meeting and you, Sir, for presiding over it. I should also like to thank Council members for their presentations on behalf of member States, and particularly for their commendation of and praise for the work of the Special Court. I think I speak for the staff of the Special Court, and in particular the staff of the Office of the Prosecutor, in saying that those who are working in this endeavour will continue until our mandate is complete to work in such a way that we are worthy of the support that the Security Council has provided.

The President: There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.6164

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6164th meeting

Friday, 17 July 2009, 12.40 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Rugunda	(Uganda)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Lutterotti
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Koudougou
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Skračić
	France	Mr. Guidée
	Japan	Mr. Takasu
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Mexico	Mr. Ruiz Massieu
	Russian Federation	Mr. Dolgov
	Turkey	Mr. Çorman
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Quarrey
	United States of America	Ms. DiCarlo
	Viet Nam	Mr. Bui The Giang

Agenda

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-40929 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 12.40 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Indonesia, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Natalegawa (Indonesia) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council condemns in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks that occurred in Jakarta, Indonesia, on 17 July 2009, causing numerous deaths and injuries. It expresses its deep sympathy and condolences to the victims of these heinous acts of terrorism and to their families, and to the people and Government of Indonesia.

"The Security Council underlines the need, and affirms its confidence in the Government of Indonesia to bring perpetrators, organizers, financiers and sponsors of these reprehensible acts of terrorism to justice, and urges all States, in accordance with their obligations under international law and relevant Security Council resolutions, to cooperate actively with the Indonesian authorities in this regard.

"The Security Council reaffirms that terrorism in all its forms and manifestations constitutes one of the most serious threats to international peace and security, and that any acts of terrorism are criminal and unjustifiable, regardless of their motivation, wherever, whenever and by whomsoever committed.

"The Security Council further reaffirms the need to combat by all means, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. The Council reminds States that they must ensure that measures taken to combat terrorism comply with all their obligations under international law, in particular international human rights, refugee and humanitarian law.

"The Security Council reiterates its determination to combat all forms of terrorism, in accordance with its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2009/22.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.6165

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6165th meeting

Wednesday, 22 July 2009, 10.30 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Kutesa	(Uganda)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. Lacroix
	Japan	Mr. Takasu
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Russian Federation	Mr. Churkin
	Turkey	Mr. Çorman
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Lord Malloch-Brown
	United States of America	Ms. DiCarlo
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-41769 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Australia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Burundi, Canada, the Central African Republic, Egypt, Germany, Guatemala, India, Italy, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, the Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand and Uruguay, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

On behalf of the Council, I wish to extend a warm welcome to His Excellency Lord Malloch-Brown, United Kingdom Minister for Africa, Asia and the United Nations; His Excellency Mr. Ebrahim Ismail Ebrahim, Deputy Minister for International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa; His Excellency Jean-Francis Bozizé, Minister Delegate at the Presidency of the Central African Republic in charge of National Defence, Veterans Affairs, Victims of War, Disarmament and Restructuring of the Army; and His Excellency Mr. Mohamed Abdullahi Omaar, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bozizé (Central African Republic), Mr. Omaar (Somalia), Mr. Ebrahim (South Africa) and the representatives of the other aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend invitations under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to His Excellency Mr. Heraldo Muñoz, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and Permanent Representative of Chile; Mr. Jordan Ryan, Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery at the United Nations Development Programme; and Mr. Alastair McKechnie, Director of the Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries Group at the World Bank.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2009/304, which contains the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uganda.

Let me begin by thanking Council members for participating in this high-level meeting to focus on the important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding. Members of the Council will recall that the Security Council, in May last year, requested the Secretary-General, the Peacebuilding Commission, international and regional organizations and Member States to consider how to support countries affected by conflict to secure sustainable peace in a faster and more effective way. I would therefore like to thank the Secretary-General for the report he has prepared, which he will be presenting today.

The task before us is to consider and refine strategies through which the United Nations and the international community can effectively support countries emerging from conflict to move towards sustainable peace, reconstruction, economic recovery and development.

Post-conflict peacebuilding is premised on the simple fact that without peace development is not possible, and yet without development peace is not durable. There is need to deliver tangible peace dividends, including the provision of basic services and the improvement of the standard of living of the population.

In accordance with current practice and framework, peacebuilding activities are not envisaged in countries that are still in conflict situations. The Security Council needs to address the critical issue of the early consideration of peacebuilding activities right from the peacemaking and peacekeeping stages.

In any peacebuilding endeavour, national leadership and ownership are of paramount importance. National authorities must take the primary responsibility for re-establishing the key institutions of governance and economic recovery, with the support of the United Nations and international partners. This requires identifying key priorities, developing and agreeing on a national strategy to address them through a widely consultative process, and mobilizing the requisite political, financial and technical support in a coordinated manner.

Our experience in Uganda illustrates the importance of identifying national priorities based on our own unique situation and conditions. We decided that it was important to address post-conflict peacebuilding, starting from 1986, in a sequenced manner, beginning with the most urgent and critical elements. These included efforts to guarantee the security of life and property; embarking on national reconciliation and unity by establishing a broad-based Government; establishing a human rights commission to investigate human rights abuses in the country; and introducing and consolidating the concept of popular democracy.

Other priorities included security sector reform by, inter alia, integrating all former fighting forces into a new national army and granting amnesty to most of them. We launched and executed a nationally agreed minimum recovery programme and then embarked on a process of constitutional reform through countrywide consultations, culminating in the promulgation of a new national Constitution in 1995.

Peacebuilding is a shared responsibility in which the United Nations, subregional and regional organizations and the wider international community have a critical role to play. It does not really matter where conflict situations arise — be it in the Balkans, Asia, Latin America or Africa. The role of regional approaches to solving problems is key because regions have more intimate knowledge of specific situations. Experience in Africa, and in the Great Lakes region in particular, shows that regional efforts can be successful.

The Regional Peace Initiative on Burundi, chaired by Uganda and facilitated by South Africa, is a good example in that regard. The knowledge and clear understanding of the political and social dynamics that the regional leaders brought to the peace process in Burundi were critical to resolving the conflict. Burundi is now making steady progress in post-conflict peacebuilding with the support of the East African Community, the African Union, the United Nations and international partners.

The Economic Community of West African States played a positive role in Liberia, while the African Union, through the African Union Mission in Somalia, is currently engaged in efforts to bring peace and stability to Somalia. Regional organizations, such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the Organization of American States, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe have also made substantial contributions to peacebuilding.

The regional organizations in Africa have the necessary human resources, but what they clearly lack are the financial resources. That is where the United Nations and the international community can be of great help. The challenge is how the United Nations can address issues of international peace and security meaningfully and remain relevant. Uganda therefore calls upon the United Nations and international partners to support regional and subregional efforts to strengthen their capacities in peacebuilding.

Post-conflict peacebuilding activities require adequate, flexible and predictable funding. There is urgent need for the United Nations system to ensure greater coherence in peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development activities. We therefore call upon the United Nations to strengthen further its strategic partnerships with the World Bank and other financial institutions. We are encouraged by the initiatives for flexible funding being undertaken by the United Nations through the Peacebuilding Fund and the launching of the in-country multi-donor trust funds. The United Nations should also focus more on implementation of the concepts of a joint United Nations vision and integrated missions in supporting peacebuilding activities.

Finally, we thank all delegations for their contribution to the draft presidential statement as an outcome of our deliberations.

I now resume my function as President of the Security Council.

I welcome the presence of the Secretary-General, His Excellency Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and invite him to take the floor.

The Secretary-General: First of all, I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for taking time to preside over this meeting on a subject of great importance to the United Nations.

In May last year, the Security Council requested a report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. I am pleased to present my report (S/2009/304). It is the product of intensive, wide-ranging consultations. It sets out an approach to peacebuilding that is better resourced, managed and coordinated. The Peacebuilding Commission discussed it last week. I welcome its commitment to championing this important agenda.

Building peace is about much more than ending war. It is about putting in place the institutions and trust that will carry people forward into a peaceful future. We often have a limited window of opportunity in which to do this. The report focuses on that crucial two-year period when conflict has ended but insecurity often persists and peace is fragile. If peace is to be sustainable, the international community must make the most of that moment and provide the right support at the right time.

Decades of international experience have taught us that, while every case is unique, certain types of support are almost always needed. Time and again, war-ravaged people have asked us to help them establish security and safety, restore basic services and core Government functions, support a political transition and jump-start economic recovery.

These are not easy tasks. I have seen the difficulties first hand. I have travelled to many countries emerging from conflict, including the Sudan, Haiti, Liberia and Timor-Leste. I have seen the costs of a slow or inadequate response to urgent post-conflict needs. Yet, I have also seen the profound difference that a well-planned and managed effort can make.

Let me highlight the five interconnected messages of my report.

The first pertains to national ownership. Peace will not take root if it comes from outside. Building peace is primarily a national challenge and responsibility. The United Nations and the international community should play a catalytic and supporting role.

The second message pertains to international leadership. Member States expect the United Nations to lead the international community. I have created a senior-level mechanism that will ensure that the right leadership and support teams are in place as early as possible.

The third message concerns coherence. Effective peacebuilding requires input from all parts of the United Nations system and key partners. Peacebuilding is not separate from mediation, peacekeeping or development aid. It is all of these working together.

The fourth refers to a common strategy. Immediately after conflict, everything feels urgent and there are many pressing needs. We need to align behind a shared approach with realistic priorities against which national and international actors can allocate scarce resources.

The fifth message concerns predictable and credible delivery. Member States need to help ensure that we have sufficient international capacity to respond rapidly and flexibly to the most urgent needs: basic safety, security and services; strengthening the rule of law; supporting political processes; and revitalizing the economy.

To that end, we need a clearer understanding of responsibilities within the United Nations, outlining who will respond in each of these key areas. We also need a deeper and more diverse pool of international civilian expertise. We need prepositioned pooled funding, such as the Peacebuilding Fund, to jump-start action, followed by faster funding from other sources. And we need more and better strategic partnerships with the World Bank, regional organizations, civil society and the private sector.

Member States, for their part, have a crucial part to play. I urge them to speak with one voice across different multilateral forums and to align bilateral support with the common strategy in each country.

Almost a decade ago, in its debate on the theme "No exit without strategy", the Security Council articulated the many challenges associated with the later stages of peacebuilding, when it is time to wind down an international peace operation. In Sierra Leone, as was discussed in this Chamber very recently, we have seen many of the "no exit" lessons being applied. In asking for the report before us, the Council recognized that it also needs to support peacebuilding more effectively from the outset. This requires the engagement and coordination of many different actors, and it requires adequate funding. Some key United Nations actors face serious challenges in securing timely financing.

I encourage the Council to look carefully at these issues as they pertain to existing and future mandates, and as part of initiatives already under way to review peacekeeping mandates. I also encourage members, in the context of next year's review of the Peacebuilding Commission, to consider how they can make more effective use of that body.

My current report is part of a series of initiatives, including my recent report on mediation and the ongoing work on peacekeeping. These efforts share a common goal — to enable the United Nations and its international partners to respond more effectively to countries in crisis in ways that are better tailored to needs on the ground.

I am determined to do my part. I am committed to driving the necessary changes through the United Nations system, but I need the Security Council's support and commitment if we are to achieve real change. I look forward to working with Council members to meet these challenges.

The President: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

I now give the floor to Mr. Muñoz.

Mr. Muñoz: I thank you, Sir, for inviting me to take part in this discussion of the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). The Peacebuilding Commission met on 13 July to discuss the report. I would like to share with the Council today my summary of those discussions.

The Peacebuilding Commission welcomed the report and endorsed the Secretary-General's approach and recommendations. The preparation of the report usefully brought together the many parts of the United Nations that deal with peacebuilding and highlighted a common understanding of the importance of peacebuilding in the United Nations system. We were pleased that the broad consultation process allowed the Commission to play a significant role in formulating the report.

Members of the Commission focused on some key points. National ownership is the cornerstone of peacebuilding. However, the commitment to national ownership as a key principle of peacebuilding will remain merely an abstract concept unless it is accompanied from the very beginning by capacity-building, starting with a clear understanding of existing capacities on the ground. National capacity-building must start immediately after the end of conflict, taking advantage of that narrow window of opportunity to lay the foundations for sustainable peace and show some peace dividends. It must be part of the entry, not the exit strategy.

Another crucial piece of the early peacebuilding puzzle is an agreed common strategy that is nationally owned and internationally supported, including — depending on the country's concrete reality — basic safety and security, political processes, basic services, core Government functions and early economic revitalization. In that effort, the United Nations staff in-country must work closely with the Peacebuilding Commission so as to ensure proper coordination and avoid duplication.

The Secretary-General's agenda for action proposes stronger, more effective and better supported United Nations leadership on the ground and the creation, as he has reported to us today, of a senior-level mechanism at Headquarters that will ensure that the right leadership and support teams are in place as early as possible. We welcome this suggestion.

Predictable international support is needed for successful peacebuilding. One essential element is greater clarity of lead roles and responsibilities within the United Nations, and enhanced coordination with other key players, such as the World Bank. The Commission welcomes the progress so far and looks forward to further advances.

Civilian experts are an important peacebuilding resource. Country rosters of pre-vetted civilian experts — not least from the global South — could help support the quick delivery of services.

International experts must complement and not replace national expertise. We welcome the Secretary-General's proposal for a review that would broaden and deepen the global pool of expertise and enhance interoperability across rosters. We also support his call regarding the United Nations Volunteers Programme. The diaspora may also be a significant resource in these areas.

We share the Secretary-General's hope that donors will be bold and innovative in establishing flexible, rapid and predictable funding for peacebuilding. We are satisfied with Peacebuilding Fund pledges and funding, and we encourage the Secretary-General to appeal to non-traditional donors, including middle-income countries and the private sector.

Pooled funding mechanisms, such as the country-level multi-donor trust funds, should be established, paying particular attention to the needs of women and historical gender imbalances. Regional organizations have increasingly been at the forefront of peace processes; the challenge ahead includes strengthening partnerships with regional actors, as well as with bilateral donors, civil society and international financial institutions, particularly the World Bank.

Many of the recommendations of the Secretary-General's report are addressed to the United Nations. We therefore welcome the Secretary-General's early initiation of an implementation plan involving all the relevant parts of the Organization. We recognize that the Peacebuilding Support Office will play an important role in this regard.

The Secretary-General's report poses several challenges for the Peacebuilding Commission. Member States recognize that peacekeepers are early peacebuilders. Peacebuilding should therefore come into play early on in the Security Council's consideration of post-conflict situations. The mainstreaming of peacebuilding into peacekeeping operations and the enhancement of the civilian components of peacebuilding operations are a must. The Security Council should consider more proactively the advice of the Commission, not because the Commission is better qualified than the Council for such a task, but only because the Commission will emphasize the linkage between security and development, as well as the longer-term view contributing to sustainable peace.

The Peacebuilding Commission's 2010 review will allow for further reflection on the role of the Commission and how it might better exercise its advisory role. Improving the working methods of the Commission is a goal on our agenda. In particular, we are exploring innovative, lighter and more flexible ways to engage with countries that may seek the Commission's advice.

I have one final reflection. The report stresses the need for early and continued emphasis on coordination and coherence, but a realistic approach will show that this is a most difficult task among multilateral actors, bilateral donors and civil society, and even within the United Nations system. Institutional positioning and turf disputes do not help peacebuilding or national Governments, and efforts to minimize them should continue.

Since many of the Secretary-General's recommendations are addressed to the United Nations system, we believe that he should be invited to report back to the Security Council, in consultation with the Peacebuilding Commission, on their implementation.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate the Commission's strong support for the Secretary-General's recommendations. Attention must now turn to their rapid implementation. The people in post-conflict countries will benefit if we move forward to action.

The President: I thank Mr. Muñoz for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Jordan Ryan.

Mr. Ryan: I thank you, Sir, for inviting the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to address the Council on this important report (S/2009/304). We in UNDP warmly welcome the report, as well as this opportunity to add the perspective of UNDP to the statement of the Secretary-General.

Under the leadership of UNDP Administrator Miss Helen Clark, we are committed to working with partners both within and outside the United Nations system to ensure the smooth and effective implementation of the recommendations contained in the report, under the guidance of the Secretary-General. The Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Support Office will play an important

role in facilitating the follow-up process, and UNDP pledges its close cooperation with both.

UNDP contributes to peacebuilding through our presence in all conflict-affected countries, including countries going through conflict, countries that have recently emerged from conflict and countries that are moving into a longer-term recovery.

Many post-conflict countries are struggling to make progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and effective and quick peacebuilding action is essential if countries are to succeed in their MDG effort. Development of national capacities must remain a core peacebuilding objective.

In moving the peacebuilding agenda forward, we must strive to effectively link short-term peacebuilding activities with longer-term recovery and development. We also need to remember that peacebuilding does not start from scratch when a conflict is over. It should always build on existing national capacities and draw on the expertise of the in-country United Nations presence, including the humanitarian and development actors.

At the country level, United Nations funds and programmes work together for peacebuilding under the leadership of a resident coordinator. When the Security Council provides a mandate, the United Nations country team works with other system partners as part of an integrated mission.

The Secretary-General's report suggests new steps to take the integration process forward and to strengthen the coordination and accountability of the United Nations country presence. The report's emphasis is rightly focused on the need for stronger and more coherent United Nations leadership teams, with the right support staff, to plan and coordinate the joint effort.

Women and youth require special attention. Peacebuilding efforts should make sure that they benefit from peace dividends and that they are fully engaged in planning and decision-making processes. In this respect, UNDP is currently deploying Senior gender advisers in 10 post-conflict countries. They will support the Organization's system-wide efforts to implement Security Council resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008) in an effort to stop sexual violence against women.

The World Bank is an important partner for the United Nations in post-conflict situations. We have gained significant experience working together on the ground in a number of post-conflict countries, but we can do even better based on recognition of each other's strengths and a continued commitment to putting global agreements for cooperation into practice at the country level.

An effective United Nations response will require active support from Member States, including the necessary funding. With this support, we in the United Nations will do our utmost, under the leadership of the Secretary-General, to match expectations of quick and effective implementation of peacebuilding activities. UNDP looks forward to contributing actively to this effort as part of the implementation of the recommendations of this report.

The President: I thank Mr. Ryan for his briefing.

I now give the floor to Mr. Alastair McKechnie.

Mr. McKechnie: The President of the World Bank, Mr. Robert Zoellick, is unfortunately unable to be here today, and I wish to transmit his greetings and convey his appreciation for this important report and for inviting the World Bank to address the Council.

The report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) recognizes that the efforts of the international community immediately post-conflict have been less than fully effective.

The World Bank was deeply involved in the preparation of the report. We welcome its findings. We applaud the critical leadership role that the United Nations can provide in post-conflict situations. We support the report's efforts to resolve the inherent tensions that arise between the need for speed in responding to fragile situations and the need for compliance with a coherent strategy that is nationally owned.

Such tensions often result from different perceptions of priorities by the international community and partner countries, which paradoxically may want a greater emphasis on building their institutions and sustainable development that reduces poverty. We should not forget also the demands for quality, the effectiveness of our support, and the need for financial accountability to maintain long-term, predictable financial support.

The report rightly recognizes that we should seek the views of the partner countries on what they consider to be their priorities. Often we will find that the highest priorities are personal security, justice and the ending of impunity, not the easier public services that the international community can readily provide. There is also a need for clear and agreed priorities around which recovery efforts can coalesce.

But the inevitable challenge remains: how can priorities be set when everything seems to be a priority? We support the recommendations of the report for more effective planning based on a post-conflict needs assessment. However, we would suggest the following five points when setting priorities.

First, priorities should be driven by country demand, not by what we think is best or what we are able to deliver. Secondly, they should provide some short-term results, preferably consistent with mid-term priorities and, at the same time, should lay the basis for sustainable development, growth and employment. Thirdly, they should aim to strengthen the legitimate authority of the State by enabling it to set and enforce rules and laws, manage its budget, deliver services effectively and embody national traditions and values. Fourthly, priorities should not aim to replace the State but to be its facilitator and enabler. And fifthly, they should consider an exit strategy, namely, how to transfer responsibility to the legitimate State as early as possible.

The Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action articulate a framework for delivering aid. Experience has shown us that aid is most effective and most supportive of State-building when it is provided under national leadership and through country systems.

In the context of peacebuilding, how do we increase our effectiveness? Effectiveness is often as much about how foreign assistance is provided as it is about the volume of that aid. Experience suggests some guidelines for effectiveness. First is to tailor our assistance to the country context. Second is to avoid taking a linear approach to our response, as support for State-building needs to take place during the peacekeeping phase, not only after it. Third is to develop institutions and policies and the preparation of investment in parallel with peacebuilding. Fourth is to sequence reforms for economic stability with political cycles, to avoid triggering governance crises that will make economic reform impossible. And fifth is to reduce the administrative burden that donors impose on weak States by aggregating projects into national programmes and pooling finance through trust funds.

Finally, we need to recognize and manage risks, not only the risks that money will be misappropriated but also the risk that peace fails because we are too bureaucratic and too slow. There are ways to manage risks in high-corruption environments, including by contracting fiduciary agents and giving voice to citizens. But we need to recognize that things will go wrong and deal with problems quickly and decisively.

The report refers to the agreements signed last year between the Secretary-General and the President of the World Bank to strengthen our partnerships in post-crisis situations. That is supported by a fiduciary principles accord that has now been signed with 11 United Nations agencies to facilitate the timely transfer of financial resources under trust funds administered either by the World Bank or the United Nations Development Group, when that is appropriate in the country context.

We see synergies and complementarities in the operation of the World Bank's State- and Peacebuilding Fund and the United Nations Peacebuilding Fund. Both instruments provide predictable, adaptive and responsive financing mechanisms specifically tailored to meet the needs of countries emerging from conflict. But the United Nations and the Bank are only elements of a wider set of agencies that work to assist countries recovering from conflict. Last year, the European Commission, the United Nations Development Group and the Bank issued a joint declaration on how they will provide assistance and support in post-crisis situations and plan recovery efforts.

Greater coherence requires strengthening other partnerships as well, particularly with regional and bilateral political, security and development organizations. The demand for speed and effectiveness dictates that international cooperation is centred and anchored in the field at the country level. Context matters, and time and directives from the centre may fail to capture the realities of a dynamic post-conflict environment. We therefore endorse the proposal that the integration steering group explore the development of mutual accountability measures at the country level. We hope that those efforts will encourage greater acknowledgement by other international actors that aid

effectiveness is born of coherency, coordination and joint mechanisms for funding and implementation.

While Government leadership is a critical ingredient in guiding post-conflict recovery and reconstruction efforts, so too is the ability of the international community to coordinate its response. In most post-conflict situations, it is the office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General that offers the key to that coordination. The wider the leadership role provided by the Special Representative for the international effort, the greater the level of delegation by agencies to senior management in the field and the better aligned agency support is to the demand of those officials. The more funding for United Nations agencies that is programmed through the office of the Special Representative, the more likely we are to achieve the levels of coherence, coordination and effectiveness we seek.

The World Bank is ready to consider more formal roles within the specialized missions, including staff secondments or better integration of conventional aid coordination mechanisms. The World Bank also stands ready to participate in joint consultations and planning on post-crisis and crisis-affected countries, so as to ensure early and effective preparations of our joint response. Let me add that we are currently working on an exchange of staff between the United Nations and World Bank headquarters to strengthen our joint response to situations of fragility and conflict.

The international community should also recognize comparative advantages arising from different mandates and capacities. Division of labour will depend upon what the country requires and the capacity of organizations to respond. The agreements between the United Nations and the World Bank set out the process for quickly agreeing our responsibilities.

The report also highlights one of the most difficult areas of development and proposes new ways of working, such as the establishment of deployable civilian capacity, which will be challenging to implement. The report card on the quality of coordination by the international community is mixed. We should not confuse capacity building with technical assistance. In his report, the Secretary-General challenges us to do better.

Going forward, we need to recognize how little we know about the effectiveness of the instruments we have to avoid a relapse into violent conflict. We need to learn as we go forward. We encourage that the impact of the innovations set out in this report be monitored and evaluated, and that we commit to continue to seek out new ways to improve our speed and effectiveness.

The current budgetary constraints faced by donor countries as a consequence of the global financial crisis must be seen as an opportunity to rationalize the international community's interventions and make them more effective. We now need to move forward expeditiously to support country efforts to consolidate peace and to lay the foundation for development that reduces poverty. We need to continue our work together to make that happen.

The President: I thank Mr. McKechnie for his briefing.

In accordance with the understanding reached among Council members, I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than five minutes, in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate their texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I shall now give the floor to the members of the Security Council.

Lord Malloch-Brown (United Kingdom): I would like to thank the Secretary-General, Ambassador Muñoz, Alistair McKechnie and Jordan Ryan for their briefings this morning. I am delighted to be able to take part in this debate myself. This is an issue in which I have been closely involved, both when working at the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank and now as a Minister in the British Government. This is an issue in which I hope the United Kingdom has been able to lead. Today's debate follows the initiative of my Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary last year to press for real improvement in the response of the United Nations to post-conflict situations.

I am also delighted that we have as Council President today someone who is both a personal friend and a representative of a country that has done so much hard work and has so much experience to share on this issue. I think having you in the chair, Mr. President, is an eloquent reminder that we have got to intensify our efforts to prevent and reduce conflict worldwide,

because countries affected by conflict face a tragic human cost. They account for a third of the people living in extreme poverty, half the children not in primary school and half the children who die before their fifth birthday.

As we know to our cost, ungoverned spaces, such as those in Afghanistan or Somalia, offer safe havens for international crime or terrorism. Today United Kingdom and Ugandan soldiers, as well as those of other Member States, are laying down their lives to build peace in these countries. United Nations peacekeepers play an indispensable role, providing space for peace agreements to take hold and protecting the most vulnerable. We will chair a Security Council debate next month, as part of our joint initiative with France, to look at how we can enhance the effectiveness of peacekeeping.

But peacekeeping alone is not enough. A third of countries fall back into conflict within five years of a peace agreement being reached, so it is critical that we improve the effectiveness of peacebuilding. We know what needs to happen in countries emerging from conflict — the economy needs to be revitalized, creating jobs that give an alternative to violence and crime. Basic services need to be kick-started, and police, courts and prisons need to be re-established so that everyone has access to accountable and affordable justice.

In other words, we need to help reconstitute the basic functions of a viable State, and that needs to happen quickly. There is a critical window of perhaps 24 months after a peace agreement is signed. Experience shows that if we do not get it right during that period, the risk of a return to conflict increases dramatically.

We too strongly welcome the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding (S/2009/304). Building on that report, I would identify five priorities for action in the coming months. We have heard something of these already.

First, we must get clarity as to the roles and responsibilities of the United Nations and the World Bank so that there is accountability for what happens on the ground. Second, we must launch a review of civilian capacities, to give us a better idea of where the gaps are and how these experts can be deployed more rapidly to build national capacities. Thirdly, effective and accountable senior United Nations leadership must be deployed from the outset, to corral international actors and drive delivery of assistance. Fourthly, access to rapid and flexible financing must be improved, including through the Peacebuilding Fund and multi-donor trust funds. Fifthly, we must build on the achievements so far of the Peacebuilding Commission. It should focus on addressing barriers to peacebuilding, ensuring that international efforts are better harmonized, and mobilizing additional resources.

The Secretary-General's report gives us a framework for a better-led, more coherent, faster and more predictable international response to immediate post-conflict situations, but the real test will be delivery on the ground. A recent United Kingdom White Paper — "Building our Common Future" — underlines our commitment to working with the United Nations, the World Bank and other Member States to help make this happen. The Secretary-General has a critical role to play. We applaud his leadership. I urge Member States to rally behind his agenda for action. We cannot afford to lose this opportunity. The human costs are simply too great.

Mr. Lacroix (France) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, my delegation wishes to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this meeting on an important subject, one close to us all. We welcome your presence here with us, and we also welcome the presence of the Secretary-General.

Permit me to make a few remarks. I wish first to thank the Secretariat, and the Secretary-General for his report (S/2009/304), which certainly provides the most in-depth thinking to date on the matter of post-conflict peacebuilding. That is a major area of work for the United Nations, with great potential, comparable to that of the tool that we have used so far, namely, peacekeeping.

However, we are only at the very beginning of this process. The report marks an essential step in thinking about improving the United Nations capacity to respond to the challenges of peacebuilding. Today, we need to pursue our thoughts and our concrete actions.

I would like to focus on two challenges. The first is that we are not yet strategic enough. A greater analytical effort is needed. Before we can begin to check the cycle of violence and conflict, we must be able to analyze the causes and factors. That approach is also true for conflict prevention.

Then we need to identify priorities. After emerging from a conflict, that is not simply a rule for action; it is the only way to move forward. On that point we welcome the recommendations in the report to make the assessments carried out by the Secretariat teams more political and to follow a logical sequence in order to be available more quickly. I wish to stress that it is only by working on a limited number of priorities that we will be effective; I think that is a comment everyone shares.

Finally, we need to be consistently opportunistic, in the good sense of the word; we must be rapid, agile and flexible. It is at the deployment of an operation, or even before, that we must begin to sketch out a peacebuilding strategy. The recommendations set out in the report to allow the deployment of civilian personnel and competent specialized teams along with the special representatives on the ground make good sense, and we hope they can be carried out.

The second challenge, as we see it, is that we are not yet fully mobilized. There is progress to be made in this area.

The United Nations has a central role to play in peacebuilding, because it alone has all of the instruments — political, military, humanitarian and development — on which we can base an effective strategy. But the United Nations is still quite fragmented in its interventions. Here also, the Secretary-General's recommendations are aimed at improving consistency in our response to these challenges, and we welcome this. We have some clear examples already, in Sierra Leone or the Central African Republic.

Setting up financial mechanisms adapted to the challenges of peacebuilding is even more necessary now, because the actions required surpass the capacity of a small number of actors. The Peacebuilding Fund by itself cannot fully play its role if mobilization by the international community is not assured. There is a role that the Peacebuilding Commission has already begun to play for the four countries on its agenda. It has broadened its donor base and is reaching out to non-traditional donors, even the private sector.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore that a rapid intervention by the international community during the immediate post-conflict phase draws on the same care for effectiveness that has led France, with the United Kingdom, to propose discussion in the Security Council on follow-up to and improvement of peacekeeping. The same principles apply: the need for better follow-up, and use of indicators and milestones.

We hope that peacebuilding will now be clearly understood as a dimension of peacekeeping, and not simply as the next stage. The requirement for effectiveness is the condition for a lasting commitment by the international community to help countries emerging from crisis.

To conclude, I will say that France fully supports the draft presidential statement submitted to us.

Mr. Takasu (Japan): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for presiding over today's important debate. I wish to thank the Secretary-General for personally presenting the very important report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). We are also grateful to the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for their very useful perspectives. I am particularly pleased that in today's debate the United Nations system as a whole is according high priority to the issue of post-conflict stabilization.

Over the course of its history, the United Nations has been faced with a multitude of challenges. Despite its best efforts, however, conflicts have not been brought to an end. Worst of all, peace agreements are often broken within a few years' time, leaving the most vulnerable groups of people trapped in a vicious circle of misery and conflict.

The United Nations has mobilized to reverse that situation, using several instruments. First, by deploying peacekeeping operations and extending humanitarian and development assistance, the United Nations has contributed to preventing the recurrence of misery and conflict in many parts of the world. Lately, the Peacebuilding Commission has promoted integrated support, but usually well after a peace agreement has been signed and peacekeepers have left the country.

So there is clearly a gap that is not being fully met by those existing instruments. In a society just emerging from conflict, there is a high expectation of safer and better livelihoods, but we have learned the hard lesson that a high price must be paid later because of the failure to take opportunities at the optimal time.

It was against that backdrop that the very important report of the Secretary-General before us

was requested by the Security Council. Today, I should like to highlight a few points of a general nature that are particularly relevant to the work of the Council.

My first point concerns the Council's relationship with peacekeeping operations. Today, when we discuss the immediate aftermath of a conflict as being up to 24 months after the signing of a peace agreement, it is important to clearly understand the relationship between peacekeeping operations and what we are talking about — peacebuilding. When a peace agreement results from United Nations peacemaking efforts, the security situation is still very fragile, so the agreement is frequently followed by the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation mandated by the Security Council. In this case, we must explore more precisely to what extent the mandate of a Council-mandated peacekeeping operation could be expanded to include peacebuilding activities such as, inter alia, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, democratic governance, the rule of law and support for capacity-building.

Recently — particularly over the past eight or nine years, I believe — the Council has authorized some of those activities in recent mandates of peacekeeping operations. But clearly, there is a limit to the degree to which a peacekeeping operation itself can carry out all of those peacebuilding activities, given the range of expertise, implementing agencies, backstopping authority at Headquarters and financing methods needed.

On the other hand, if some of these peacebuilding activities are carried out by other entities — whether they be United Nations entities or others — in parallel with the peacekeeping operation, we need to consider how the mission can better harmonize and coordinate with those other activities. Therefore, the Council's comprehensive review of the effective implementation of peacekeeping operations — including through the ongoing work of the Working Group of the Whole on United Nations Peacekeeping Operations — is important. We commend the Secretariat's initiatives, such as the New Horizon project, which is very useful. They are all integral parts of the United Nations effort aimed at ensuring stronger and more coherent responses to international threats.

I should also like to stress that it is important for the Council to acknowledge that peacekeeping operations and peacebuilding should be pursued not in sequence, but simultaneously.

My second point concerns strategy and leadership. One of the characteristics of post-conflict peacebuilding — unlike peacekeeping operations — is the need for active participation by a diverse range of experts and many actors and for programmes involving various methods of work and financing. Therefore, it is indispensable that various United Nations organs and other stakeholders work in a coordinated and coherent fashion from the very outset.

In promoting partnership, national leaders and diverse partners must share a common vision of what they are working together to achieve in order to avoid a relapse into conflict. National ownership is of the very first order, as everyone has stressed so far. However, we must recognize that, in the immediate aftermath of conflict, national capacity is very limited. Therefore, with full respect for the country's ownership, the United Nations is expected to take a leading role and to adopt an action-oriented approach, initially with a streamlined priority plan and subsequently with an integrated strategy. We must be flexible in its sequencing and simplify planning and prioritize projects for speedy action. It is essential to produce a tangible, visible outcome in order to gain the confidence of the local population, even before an elaborate integrated strategy is in place.

To pursue a common vision and coherence among various players, we need strong leadership. The most senior United Nations representative in the field is usually tasked with the challenges of bringing the partners to the table and mobilizing resources. It is equally important to ensure that field representatives receive coordinated guidance and support from Headquarters. Therefore, we welcome the Secretary-General's initiative to strengthen his senior-level coordinating mechanism at Headquarters. The responsibilities of the lead department and the role of other departments, programmes and funds at Headquarters should be clearly defined so as to maximize impacts and resources.

My third point concerns implementing capacity — people and money. In order to implement peacebuilding efforts according to a vision or a priority plan, we need to strengthen implementation capacity. Here, civilians with experience in a wide range of specialized areas are essential. Recommendations such

as a standing capacity for a quick-reaction team — as mentioned in the Secretary-General's report — creating a roster and training are important and deserve detailed examination and implementation on a priority basis. The United Nations should also tap into the knowledge and expertise of particular Member States, especially those in the developing world. For its part, Japan initiated a training programme for Asian peacebuilding experts at the Hiroshima Peacebuilders Centre three years ago. We are ready to support United Nations efforts in this area.

Mobilizing additional resources is vitally important. The recommendations that a new type of multi-donor trust fund — either country-specific or general-purpose — be created and that the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund be expanded need careful review in terms of their feasibility. In the current situation, in which the peacekeeping budget is consuming so many resources, and in the light of the substantial resource requirements in the immediate aftermath of conflict — here, we are talking about a different magnitude of resources — we all need to think creatively and to make the best possible use of existing channels, including international financial institutions such as the World Bank and regional development banks. The creation of new financial mechanisms needs to be attractive from the donors' point of view. We also need to identify non-traditional partners and expand the donor base.

Finally, the Peacebuilding Commission has definitely played an extremely important role in mobilizing support for four specific countries designated by the Security Council. They are making serious efforts — in most cases, after the peacekeeping operation in question has been completed. The strength and comparative advantage of the Peacebuilding Commission is its convening and coordinating power, which is based on an elaborate integrated strategy. I believe that what is now necessary is to consolidate the Commission's achievements, rather than to expand its responsibilities beyond its capacity.

Of course, Japan is open to the idea of examining how the Peacebuilding Commission can make a difference in the early phase of post-conflict recovery. But we need to realize that peacebuilding activities in the immediate aftermath of conflict require different methods of work and support mechanisms — not only on the ground, but also at Headquarters — from those that have been employed over the past several years. We should also recognize that, in the situation under consideration, peacekeeping operations are most often being deployed in parallel. Therefore, I believe that, as the parent body, the Security Council has the responsibility to play its useful role of tasking the Peacebuilding Commission with providing advice and assistance on specific aspects of peacebuilding challenges.

In conclusion, we very much hope to take advantage of this opportunity and that the United Nations will strengthen its response to post-conflict early recovery.

Ms. DiCarlo (United States of America): Mr. President, the United States welcomes your presence today and expresses its gratitude for this opportunity to discuss peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. We would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his comments and Ambassador Muñoz, Mr. Ryan and Mr. McKechnie for their briefings. In addition, we express our appreciation to United Nations staff worldwide who are working to help countries make the difficult transition from conflict to peace.

Too many populations that have endured the hardships of conflict experience persistent violence and instability. They often lack the conditions necessary to restore governance, restart economies and rebuild communities. Shoring up peace processes at risk can often take attention from the wider efforts needed to put countries on a steady path to long-term stability and development.

The overarching objective of our peacebuilding efforts must be to assist local authorities to develop the capacity to manage their own transitions to recovery. This means helping them restart basic functions of governance, establish the conditions for economic recover and create a secure environment in which affected populations can begin to rebuild shattered lives.

While other actors besides the United Nations have a role in peacebuilding, an effective United Nations can provide an unparalleled platform for unity of effort and overall success. The Secretary-General's report (S/2009/304) provides a clear road map for the United Nations system to ensure that its assistance is well conceived, well led and sufficiently resourced. We welcome the Secretary-General's personal commitment

to ensuring an improved United Nations response in post-conflict situations.

The United States strongly supports the report's recommendations on strategy, leadership and accountability, which are essential to delivering critical support to national authorities, and we agree that effective civilian capacity and response should be at the core of international efforts to support sustainable peace. We welcome the report's emphasis on the need for rapid deployment of high-quality leadership and multidisciplinary teams to backstop it, and we particularly welcome the emphasis on Southern capacity, an undertapped and invaluable resource.

Let me also underscore the important contribution of women to post-conflict recovery and the need to involve women more actively in the essential tasks of rebuilding communities and lives.

The Secretary-General's report also makes a number of observations regarding financing post-conflict activities. The United States agrees that early and flexible assistance is crucial. We also support the call to revitalize efforts to strengthen cooperation in peacebuilding between the United Nations and international financial institutions. The division of labour within the United Nations system and between the United Nations and other key partners continues to be a high priority for us, and we stress the need to make progress in this area.

Efforts to build national capacity must start early. Capacity-building cannot be delayed until the day an international security presence departs. Early and sustained attention to the requirements of peacebuilding must occur alongside peacekeeping in order to ensure a successful transition to a durable peace. To that end, we welcome early dialogue with the Peacebuilding Commission.

The United States will work to ensure that the Council takes earlier account of peacebuilding in decision-making on peace operations and in reviewing mandates. We have already expressed our intention to consider critical peacebuilding requirements when we review peacekeeping missions in Liberia and Haiti this coming autumn.

Council members will soon have had the opportunity to consider questions related to mediation, peacebuilding and peacekeeping, including the New Horizon initiative of the United Nations. The United States believes that now is the time to move forward on these issues in a more integrated way.

Finally, we also are fully supportive of the draft presidential statement submitted by the delegation of Uganda.

Mr. Puente (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation welcomes your presence, Mr. President, at this important meeting of the Security Council. We thank the Secretary-General for introducing his very important report (S/2009/304), which brings together analysis and experience gathered over the past two decades in countries emerging from conflict. We also welcome Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, Mr. Jordan Ryan and Mr. Alastair McKechnie.

My delegation agrees with the Secretary-General that the period immediately following the cessation of hostilities is a vital time for laying the foundations of true peacebuilding. In that initial phase, cooperation and coordination among lead actors is essential in order to promote coherent, comprehensive strategies and plans of action. Obviously, priorities must be established during that crucial post-conflict phase. Then, once there has been progress on security and on meeting the basic needs of the population, it is essential to take steps to restore legitimate government institutions seen as representative of all national groups, and to introduce political, legal, economic and administrative reforms making possible a properly functioning and harmonious relationship between the State and society.

Mexico has always stressed that national ownership is key to peacebuilding efforts. For that reason, along with the need for collective support by international actors, measures must be fundamentally aimed at strengthening and promoting national leadership and ownership, without ignoring an appropriate balance between promoting local responsibility and promoting international support, as the Secretary-General points out.

In that regard, the development of political efforts towards reconciliation is of particular importance. Trust and national reconciliation are key elements in defining a framework for action which incorporates priorities set by the local actors themselves, has the support of international teams and includes a comprehensive view of the role of the United Nations in the political, humanitarian, security and development spheres.

The agenda outlined by the Secretary-General highlights the importance of improving coherence and coordination, clearly defining functions and responsibilities, promoting national capacity, ensuring predictable resources, preparing studies on a country's needs and situation, and ensuring accountability. We believe that those areas are crucial for improving the response of the United Nations in its reconstruction activities. Mexico supports measures aimed at attaining those objectives and supports the Secretary-General's initiative on seeking appropriately qualified personnel to carry out the complex tasks needed for the Organization's activities both at Headquarters and on the ground, making use in particular of permanent staff members and specialized peacebuilding professionals.

The initiatives regarding the recruitment of trained personnel from the Southern Hemisphere and regarding the participation of women — whose involvement in peacebuilding tasks, we believe, is essential — merit particular mention. Mexico supports the report's well-considered proposal to create a senior-level mechanism ensuring that both managers and regional support teams will be ready to support post-conflict activities. We propose that such a team could be headed by an eminent individual from the South; we look forward to hearing more specific information about the membership and functions of this mechanism.

My delegation sees the Partnership Framework Agreement signed with the World Bank as a very positive step forward, this will make possible improved strategic coordination and enhanced impact of collective endeavours.

With respect to donors, we agree with the Secretary-General that measures should be taken to find solutions that will establish flexible, rapid, predictable and more risk-tolerant funding modalities. In that regard, it would also be appropriate to encourage donors to disburse resources in accordance with the timetables that have been set, so that funding will arrive on time for strategies that are already being implemented.

Mexico believes that the work of the Peacebuilding Commission is crucial for a coherent and comprehensive approach to promoting reconstruction in the immediate aftermath of conflict. My country recognizes the Commission's achievements to date and encourages it to continue to enhance and broaden its advisory role in countries on its agenda and to ensure timely follow-up with respect to progress in implementing Strategic Frameworks for Peacebuilding. My country believes that the Commission must play a central role, in coordination with other United Nations actors, in implementing the recommendations of the Secretary-General. In our view, it is not only the Security Council that must be more proactive in seeking the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission; the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council must do the same, in terms of coherence, greater mobilization of resources and coordination of efforts with entities outside the system, along with working with local actors to devise and implement peacebuilding strategies.

Mexico has participated in Lebanon, Timor-Leste, Haiti, Iraq and Bosnia and Herzegovina, assisting those Governments in their electoral institution-building efforts. We have also put forward proposals for electoral cooperation within the framework of the peacebuilding strategies for Guinea-Bissau and Burundi. Mexico will continue to make a contribution to peace efforts in countries in the immediate post-conflict phase by providing technical assistance and training of decision makers in the electoral sphere when such assistance is requested.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express its support for the draft presidential statement put forward by the Ugandan delegation.

Mr. Vilović (Croatia): Mr. President, allow me to begin by welcoming you here with us and thanking you for chairing this meeting. We also thank your delegation for organizing this debate, which has focused our attention on a topic that not only deserves the sustained attention of the Security Council but also needs to be approached in a coherent and coordinated manner. Let me also thank the Secretary-General for being here with us and for his remarks in which he presented us with concrete steps for moving forward on actions charted by the presidential statement that the Council adopted last year (S/PRST/2008/16) under the United Kingdom presidency. We would also like, of course, to thank Ambassador Muñoz and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank for their contributions today.

While Croatia aligns itself with the statement to be made on behalf of the European Union, allow me to

add some further remarks in our national capacity. Post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization has been recognized as critical in laying the foundations for lasting and sustainable peace. The early success of peacebuilding efforts is undoubtedly a matter of collective interest, as failed peacebuilding risks bringing about a definite backlash and the return to violence and new wars. Given that the window for action in a post-conflict period may not be longer than a few — approximately two — years, it is indispensable that those involved in peacebuilding be ready to start immediately and offer rapid support to national authorities alongside a peacekeeping deployment. Clear goals, effective leadership and coordination, adequate resources and an appropriate mandate are required in order to be able to rapidly provide basic security and early peace dividends as well as to build confidence in a political process and expand core national capacity in a highly volatile environment.

We welcome the Secretary-General's report before us (S/2009/304) as making an important contribution to coherence and the integration of efforts on a practical level by identifying challenges and spelling out a number of concrete steps to develop and improve United Nations capabilities in support of national efforts to end war and secure a sustainable peace. We particularly welcome the five points stressed by the Secretary-General and offer our full support in that respect.

Croatia is pleased to see that the approach taken by the Secretary-General has prominently endorsed the concept of national ownership of the peacebuilding effort. Our own experience during the war imposed on Croatia in the 1990s, when a number of United Nations missions and agencies operated on the ground, led us to conclude that external actors may have come with the best of intentions, but in some cases were not able to understand the real needs of the population or cooperate effectively with each other or with the local institutions involved. External actors alone may sometimes be ill-equipped to rebuild the institutions of a war-torn State. Peacebuilding efforts anchored at the country level are inextricably linked to their legitimacy and sustainability. National actors need to be part of an early peace dividend.

It is our view that the key demand regarding peace operations in general is sustainability. As the Secretary-General mentions in his report, peace operations are not quick fixes. There can be early windows of opportunity during which peace can be achievable, but there is also a series of small practical movements and undertakings — the so-called everyday life of a peace operation — which have to be given our full attention.

We have to build upon early successes and achievements in the field; we have no right to be discouraged by the obstacles and setbacks that we will inevitably face. Likewise, we believe that capacity-building is crucial and might easily be the most fundamental issue in peacekeeping. We should also factor in the unavoidable issue of spoilers, against whom we have to fight with patience and resilience.

For Croatia, the centrepiece of international peacebuilding efforts continues to be found in the United Nations architecture, notably in the Peacebuilding Commission, which, together with the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund, represents the key mechanism to ensure greater coherence in international efforts, including on one of the key issues: the sustainable financing of peacebuilding. As the principal organ for maintaining international peace and security, the Security Council is well-placed to provide suggestions for integrated peacebuilding and to offer guidance in situations on its agenda.

While the United Nations is increasingly expected to play a leadership role in the field, it is often just one among many actors on the ground. The report rightly points out the need to build strategic partnerships, notably with the World Bank. Such partnerships need to be based on recognizing the clear comparative advantages provided by different actors on the international, regional and subregional level, while integrating the peacemaking, peacekeeping and development spheres. This in turn underscores the need for greater clarity in delineating the role and responsibilities of different actors, both within and outside the United Nations, and the need to have well-defined mandates that are complementary, mutually reinforcing and achievable.

Croatia is grateful to the Secretary-General for presenting a concrete agenda for action aimed at strengthening United Nations responsiveness in the immediate aftermath of conflict, based on effective leadership, enhanced coordination and accountability and predictable civilian deployment and financing. We

support the agenda and, in particular, its recommendations aimed at strengthening effective and accountable senior United Nations leadership on the ground as well as those promoting integrated planning and common assessments and the strategic consolidation of competing individual agendas.

At all times, local actors and the development of their capacities need to remain at the heart of the process. In order to meet peacebuilding priorities, the United Nations has to provide for the deployment of civilian experts, and we welcome the steps proposed by the Secretary-General aimed at expanding and improving existing capacities. We also recognize that success largely depends on reliable funding mechanisms and support.

Croatia believes that the text of the draft presidential statement we are to adopt today reflects the main messages of this debate, and it has our support. We see efforts aimed at enhancing responsiveness in post-conflict environments by adopting a more coherent, effective and focused approach as part and parcel of the wider effort to strengthen the ability of the United Nations to play its role to the fullest extent in conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, in an integrated and coherent manner.

Mr. Urbina (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to begin by thanking the Secretary-General for introducing his report on peacebuilding (S/2009/304) and for his presence here. We would also like to thank Lord Malloch-Brown, Ambassador Muñoz, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, Mr. Ryan and Mr. McKechnie for their participation in our debate and for their contributions.

Costa Rica believes that peacebuilding is not just an ingredient that we should think of when we are preparing to end a peacekeeping operation. It is actually an objective that we should bear in mind whenever we are preparing for the United Nations to intervene, as has been repeatedly recalled here today. We advocate that the international community include that aspect from the earliest stages of a peacekeeping operation. If the international community, led by the United Nations system, acts rapidly, coherently and effectively, it will significantly increase the possibilities of building peace and laying the foundations for sustainable development.

We must always bear in mind the fact that peacebuilding is, first and foremost, a national responsibility that naturally requires the primary participation of national actors to build sustainable and lasting peace. Consequently, peacebuilding must be centred on building up national capacities. Strengthening the authorities so that they exercise their responsibility is the basis on which a society can build coexistence, reconciliation and tolerance and generate a common purpose as a nation.

However, that responsibility is also a shared one, which the international community must actively support, as the Secretary-General pointed out, under a well-established international leadership capable of coordinating a coherent effort within a common strategy that produces tangible and credible results.

The United Nations must offer a rapid and effective response to countries devastated by conflict, which requires the augmentation of the existing national capacities and a robust deployment that can support national efforts in the most diverse tasks. The effort of the international community quite often focuses on the necessary presence of forces whose objective is to end the violence. Costa Rica believes that it is necessary to increase the contingents of international civilian experts available to support the most diverse development needs of national capacities in all phases of the intervention.

Poverty and economic and social differences are a threat to the sustainability of the achievements reached during peacekeeping operations. Fighting those threats means fostering economic growth and fairness. Economic revitalization and early employment generation, in particular for young people and demobilized former combatants, are essential.

Women play a predominant role in those tasks, since, in most cases, they have been the greatest victims of the conflicts and their involvement is key to the revitalization of the economy and the reconciliation and peacebuilding processes. The United Nations must do everything within its scope to protect them and their children during the conflict phases and to encourage their active participation in the peacebuilding and peace consolidation tasks.

The issue of the sustainability of peace being linked to economic growth will not yield the desired success without the consideration of fairness. Public policies and ethical practices that foster equal

opportunities, giving access to basic State services such as education and health, are indispensable for early peace dividends to arise in the process. In addition, development cooperation, which must play a relevant role in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, as well as in establishing the foundations for sustainable development, has an important place.

Reducing military spending is one of the most effective ways to boost socio-economic development. Costa Rica is a clear example of that. Redirecting our military spending to sectors with social impact has borne visible dividends for my country, even for the most sceptical, guaranteed the population relatively high levels of human development and increased our contribution to peace and regional stability. If the international community's intervention encourages and stimulates the decision of countries in post-conflict situations to moderate their military spending and to invest increasingly more in health, education and housing and increasingly less in weapons and soldiers, that step will undoubtedly open more opportunities for greater peace dividends.

I wish to conclude by taking advantage of this opportunity to praise the work of the Peacebuilding Commission and of the Support Office of that Commission. We believe the expertise that both those bodies can contribute to be very valuable to the drafting of mandates of the peacekeeping missions that this Council authorizes.

We also thank the Secretary-General for his commitment to this topic and for his report, which, in our view, represents considerable progress in the area of peacebuilding processes and, together with his plan of action, constitutes the beginning of the implementation of initiatives to promote a peace that is seen not only as the lack of conflict but rather as a lasting and sustainable peace based on reconciliation, coexistence and tolerance and centred on the belief in the country's shared purpose to eradicate the causes and the incentives of the conflict.

I wish to express the appreciation and the support of my country for the work on the draft presidential statement that the delegation of Uganda has put forward for the conclusion of this debate.

Mr. Liu Zhenmin (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for making a special trip to New York to preside over today's meeting. We welcome the report of the Secretary-General (S/2009/304) and wish to thank him for his presence and his presentation. Our thanks also go to Ambassador Muñoz and Mr. McKechnie for their respective briefings.

Peacebuilding is a new concept that appeared following the end of the cold war. In 1992, former Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, in An Agenda for Peace (S/24111), for the first time introduced the concept of peacebuilding. That was another milestone in the collective security system of the United Nations following the establishment of peacekeeping operations. It shows that the international community has realized that the end of a conflict does not necessarily mean the arrival of peace. Post-conflict peacebuilding is highly relevant to durable peace and security in countries that are emerging from conflict.

Over the past decade and before, the United Nations has played a very significant role in post-conflict peacebuilding with notable achievements and has also accumulated rich experience. When the Peacebuilding Commission was established in 2005, that signalled a very important step forward in peacebuilding.

However, the United Nations is also faced with many challenges with regard to peacebuilding. Under certain circumstances, national ownership is not fully recognized, intervention in post-conflict peacebuilding is not timely, financial contributions are inadequate and multilateral and bilateral coordination are insufficient.

China supports the efforts to further strengthen the capacity and leading role of the United Nations in peacebuilding and the coordination and coherence of peacebuilding activities.

I wish to make the following four points. First, respect for national ownership is the cardinal principle of post-conflict peacebuilding. The primary task of peacebuilding is to restore the governance mechanisms of the nations concerned. The nations involved and their political leaders should put national interests above everything else. They should respect and effectively implement peace agreements and resolve their differences through dialogue and consultation, based on a commitment to national reconciliation, democratic reconstruction and economic rehabilitation and development.

When the international community is involved in peacebuilding efforts, it should listen to the views of

the Governments and peoples of the countries involved and fully respect the political, cultural, legal and religious traditions of the affected countries. International assistance strategies should be tailored to the specific needs of the countries affected and should fully consider the priorities established by those countries.

It is not possible for peacebuilding to have a one-size-fits-all standard. A peacebuilding strategy should be tailored to the specific conditions of the affected country. Attention should be paid to enhanced capacity-building and to the training of personnel during the implementation of peacebuilding processes. Priority should be given to existing personnel and expertise of the countries affected.

Secondly, adequate funding is a fundamental guarantee of effective post-conflict peacebuilding. Post-conflict countries are mostly war-torn and in a chaotic state, with inadequate governance and development capacities. Swift and timely support and assistance by the international community are indispensable. The Peacebuilding Fund and other bilateral and multilateral donors have played a very important role and have provided many resources, but they remain unable to meet genuine needs. China supports improving the operation of the Peacebuilding Fund, expediting disbursements and strengthening outcome evaluation and accountability.

The Secretary-General has recommended that, in the light of the special needs of the countries concerned, donors should transform their thinking on assistance in order to create a flexible, rapid assistance model with predictable funding, and that they should consider the establishment of innovative funding channels such as country-specific funds. Those recommendations merit serious consideration.

Thirdly, coordinated activities at different stages of peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are necessary to create durable peace for the countries affected. Conflicts in the world today are increasingly complex and diverse. The objectives of peacebuilding require an integrated systematic strategy. Peacebuilding should be taken into account beginning at the stage of peacemaking. Only when the security situation has been stabilized, when a highly representative Government is in place and when national reconciliation is being promoted can the environment for economic reconstruction and rehabilitation exist. Only when economic reconstruction and rehabilitation are possible, can the people share in the peace dividend and the peace process be built on a solid political basis. Justice and the rule of law are the necessary conditions for the stability and development of countries and regions emerging from conflict. But without development, justice and the rule of law will only be castles in the air. Combating impunity must be consistent with the overall need for political dialogue and expedited national reconciliation.

Fourthly, strengthened coordination and coherence among multilateral institutions and donor countries is an important channel to create synergies within the international community on post-conflict peacebuilding. The United Nations should continue to play a leading role in the area of peacebuilding and should establish and coordinate stable and coordinated relations with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and other international partners and fully consolidate assistance resources from the various funds. United Nations agencies and entities should have a clear division of responsibility to strengthen cooperation. The Peacebuilding Commission, as the primary body for coordinating United Nations peacebuilding endeavours, should play a greater role in coordinating international peacebuilding efforts.

At present, Africa is not only an important continent for United Nations peacekeeping operations, but also a focus of United Nations peacebuilding efforts. The international community should strengthen its assistance to peacebuilding in Africa in order to help affected countries strengthen their peacebuilding, rehabilitation and reconstruction capacities.

China supports a greater role in peacebuilding efforts for the African Union. We call upon the international community to continue to provide Africa with assistance in order to help its countries emerge from conflict and turbulence and achieve stability and development.

The failure or success of peacebuilding efforts in Africa will be a litmus test for United Nations peacebuilding mechanisms. We hope that the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Secretary-General and other relevant entities and bodies will work together to steadily scale up United Nations peacebuilding

capacity and make positive contributions to the maintenance of world peace.

Mr. Codman (Turkey): First of all, Mr. President, let me join previous speakers in welcoming Your Excellency and commending the Ugandan presidency for organizing this timely meeting on post-conflict peacebuilding and preparing the draft presidential statement, which we fully support. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his substantive report (S/2009/304) and briefing, which included valuable assessments and recommendations on how to develop United Nations activities pertaining to post-conflict peacebuilding. I wish also to thank the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, the Assistant Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and the representative of the World Bank for their valuable contributions.

I will try not to repeat what has been said around the table regarding the Secretary-General's report. In brief, we support the Secretary-General in his efforts to streamline the response of the United Nations in the immediate aftermath of conflict, and we share his ideas with respect to the way forward. Yet, I would like to emphasize and reiterate some issues which we deem particularly important.

As experience shows, winning peace is often more difficult than winning war. Peace processes in their early stages are often fragile, and relapse into conflict poses an even greater threat. Thus, the risk of failure is very high if peace is not supported from day one. In that respect, the first two years after the end of a conflict are perhaps the most critical period, during which we can either sow the seeds of a lasting peace or set the course towards a dead end, albeit with good intentions.

It is also a fact that tangible results in that period can be achieved only if political, social, humanitarian and economic considerations, as well as security needs, are addressed in a holistic manner. In this context and as was pointed out in the thematic debate held on 29 June under Turkey's presidency of the Council, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are inseparable, integral parts of a whole, and success can come only if we treat them as such.

In the realm of peacebuilding, the United Nations undoubtedly has a significant role to play. There is ample room for improving the United Nations response to post-conflict situations, including, first and foremost, taking the necessary measures to ensure that the entire United Nations system acts in unison towards a single set of objectives and delivers as one. Quick and effective results can be achieved only through such a synergy of efforts. Thus, we welcome and support the Secretary-General's recommendations towards that end.

That said, and notwithstanding its key leadership responsibility, the United Nations is not the only actor that can make a difference on the ground in the immediate aftermath of a conflict. Indeed, given the manifold and multifaceted challenges, effective peacebuilding requires much broader international support. Thus, the coherence and coordination of international endeavours become key to helping countries succeed in their efforts to construct and implement a viable road map to peace. Indeed, echoing the words of the Secretary-General,

> "National authorities, the United Nations system and other international partners can have a much greater and earlier collective impact if we agree on an early strategy with defined and sequenced priorities, and align action and resources behind that strategy" (*S/2009/304, para. 6*).

In other words, the strategy for building peace ought to be devised as early as possible, should cover all aspects of the requirements of the post-conflict situation, has to be based on the common vision of national and international partners alike, and must be well supported by financial resources and technical expertise.

Additionally, priority-setting must reflect the unique conditions and needs of the country, taking into account the lessons learned from past experiences and matching the existing capacities available to the task in hand. The expertise and accumulated experience of the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme, in particular, can be extremely helpful in guiding post-conflict recovery and reconstruction. We also believe that the rapidly progressing Peacebuilding Commission could and should play an important role in promoting an integrated approach to peacebuilding. We therefore look forward to the review in 2010 with a view to further enhancing its capacity and effectiveness.

In the light of the foregoing, we agree with the five-point agenda set out by the Secretary-General to facilitate an earlier and more coherent response of the wider international community that reflects all these

core elements. In particular, we strongly support the view that building national capacity and thus ensuring national ownership is an essential priority and that it has to be considered from the outset as the central element of all peacebuilding efforts.

Indeed, we have to seize the rather limited window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of conflict by responding rapidly and effectively in support of the development of national capacities across the entire spectrum, ranging from security to the rule of law, from national reconciliation to electoral processes, and from basic socio-economic services to the return of refugees and internally displaced persons.

Cognizant of the importance of delivering substantial assistance in these key areas, Turkey continues to focus its support in post-conflict societies on these key deliverables. For instance, our policies and programmes in Iraq and Afghanistan, where we continue to undertake rather ambitious reconstruction and development activities, are designed precisely for that purpose. Turkey's provincial reconstruction team in Vardak, Afghanistan, in particular, is a good example of our comprehensive and multifaceted approach, placing national capacity-building at its core.

We also recognize the importance of rapidly deployable civilian capacity to help achieve these key deliverables, and we support the Secretary-General's recommendation that the pool of civilian experts be broadened.

Finally, I would like to touch upon the issue of financing. Better peacebuilding practices require better financing. Thus, we recognize the need for more flexible and predictable funding for post-conflict peacebuilding efforts. In this context, the Peacebuilding Fund is setting a good example. Turkey stands fully behind its commitments to the Fund and makes its contributions to the Fund without caveat. We also agree with the observations of the Secretary-General that the country-level multi-donor trust funds should be used more extensively and that the partnership between the United Nations and the World Bank must be further improved.

Before concluding, I would like to underline once again Turkey's continued commitment to supporting the enhancement of the United Nations peacebuilding efforts in every possible way, as well as our determination to help ensure a well-coordinated international response in the immediate aftermath of conflict, which represents a vital window of opportunity to build and sustain peace. As Ambassador Muñoz said, the time has come to move from words to action, and Turkey is ready to assume its fair share in this endeavour.

Mr. Dabbashi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I am pleased to see you, Sir, presiding over this important meeting. Your brotherly country launched this wise and timely initiative, and we are extremely thankful to you for it. We also thank the Secretary-General for introducing his valuable report (S/2009/304), and the Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for their important contributions.

Over the past two decades, the United Nations has done a great deal to prevent and resolve conflicts and to maintain and build peace. While the Organization has several achievements in this area to its credit, efforts to ensure stability and economic recovery, in particular in the aftermath of a ceasefire or the signing of peace agreements, continue to face great challenges. In-depth study is required to overcome the difficulties and shortcomings and to determine the most expeditious way to end a conflict, restore trust among the various sectors of an affected society, and implement programmes to promote economic recovery and sustainable development.

In his report, the Secretary-General defines the most important and urgent objectives for peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. These include providing basic security, delivering peace dividends, shoring up and building confidence in the political process, and strengthening core national capacity to lead peacebuilding efforts. I do not believe that anyone can have any objection to those goals, but the great challenge is how to respond effectively to those priority goals.

In his report, the Secretary-General proposes a plan for rapid response within the United Nations and other actors in order to meet the following challenges: first, to ensure rapid deployment of more effective and more solidly structured United Nations teams; secondly, to set priorities and ensure that resources are available to implement them; thirdly, to provide United Nations support for national ownership and developing national capacity from the beginning; fourthly, to strengthen and rationalize United Nations capacity to

identify staff, expertise and resources that can be deployed immediately in the post-conflict peacebuilding environment; and fifthly, to work with donors to ensure that financing mechanisms function more speedily and flexibly and are more risk-tolerant and better aligned.

We thank the Secretary-General and other United Nations departments for putting forward these elements. However, we feel that it is clear that each of those elements faces a number of challenges, which will demand greater effectiveness, despite the enormous efforts of the Secretariat and Member States in recent years. I would like to focus on the two most important challenges, which I believe are critical to building and consolidating peace. These two challenges are capacity-building and financing.

We all know that, in the aftermath of a conflict, the institutions of a State have been dismantled. The country lacks capacity and expertise on the ground. The financial system is completely ineffective. The sources of financing are not guaranteed. These conditions make national Governments incapable of carrying out their mission.

There is no doubt, then, that the first priority of peacebuilding is to form a stable political system. This requires building and developing essential capacities of the State so that it can restore its legitimacy and provide basic services to its citizens. This will promote economic recovery and strengthen the labour market. That is why we support the view that building such capacity must be a prime element of any peacebuilding effort from the very onset. We believe that such capacity should be based primarily on available local expertise, and after that on expertise provided by countries that share the same culture, as well as by regional and subregional organizations, whenever possible.

Major international organizations should take full advantage of local capacities in the given country. We should avoid the excessive use of international staff so that employment opportunities in the country in question are not undermined. Two sectors where it is important to strengthen capacity in post-conflict peacebuilding are security and finance.

The first is linked to stability, security and justice, which are key to restoring citizens' trust in their Government and convincing them that peace has its dividends. The second sector is clearly linked to State revenue and to its management. If there is no effective financial or tax system, the State will not be able to meet its obligations or provide basic services to its citizens, and runs the risk of social instability and relapse into conflict.

Reconstruction efforts face a number of obstacles resulting from limited financing channelled through weak and often inadequate mechanisms. It is therefore necessary to find a way to make financing flexible, predictable and rapid, as well as sufficient and timely. We hope that the Partnership Framework Agreement between the United Nations and the World Bank will provide for effective management of multi-donor funding and facilitate the use of that funding.

We also hope that the Peacebuilding Commission will play a greater role in finding innovative ways to secure funding for peacebuilding and to encourage donors to provide speedier, more flexible and more risk-tolerant funding. We believe the Peacebuilding Fund can make a greater contribution to bridging the gaps between pledged funding and available funding.

We welcome the workplan proposed by the Secretary-General with regard to the United Nations response in the early post-conflict phase. We reaffirm the importance of the role to be played by the Secretary-General's representatives on the ground in bringing together all influential actors in the aftermath of a conflict, so that strategies and plans of action can be adopted based on a national approach and tasks prioritized and delimited. Financing must also be provided from the outset.

Mr. Mayr-Harting: Mr. President, we highly appreciate your presiding over this important meeting. We express our thanks to the Ugandan presidency of the Security Council for having organized this debate.

Let me also thank the Secretary-General for the important presentation he made to us today. We also welcome Ambassador Muñoz, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission, and the representatives of the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme for their contributions.

Austria associates itself with the statement to be delivered by the representative of Sweden on behalf of the European Union later in this meeting.

Let me say that seizing the window of opportunity in the immediate aftermath of a conflict is a crucial investment in order to lay the ground for

long-term peace and stability. We concur with the Secretary-General that it is essential for the international community to ensure that a peacebuilding perspective is in place from the very first days after the cessation of a conflict. Peacebuilding efforts must be undertaken and supported from the earliest stage onwards, and as the representative of Japan and others have said, they must go hand in hand with the possible deployment of integrated peacekeeping missions.

In order for peacebuilding measures to prove successful, national ownership must be at the centre of all efforts. All peacebuilding efforts should therefore draw upon existing national capacities, as the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission has already said, while at the same time assisting with capacity deployment. From our point of view, this should also include the identification of opportunities for local private-sector engagement. Let me add that local private-sector engagement can also play a role when it comes to procurement for United Nations peacekeeping.

The protection of civilians and effective programmes for disarmament and demobilization and reintegration must be key priorities in the immediate aftermath of a conflict. There should be a clear focus on the long-term reintegration of former combatants and on the strengthening of the rule of law and institutional reform, including security-sector reform. Short-term peacebuilding measures must be undertaken with a view to long-term peacebuilding. The establishment of, and support for, effective and independent justice and reconciliation mechanisms is crucial. That will contribute to justice, long-term peace and reconciliation in war-torn societies, thereby helping to minimize the risk of future violations.

Austria believes that successful peacebuilding can take place only if all the relevant actors are included. I would therefore also like to express my support for the comment made by the representative of the United States. We need to acknowledge the vital role played by women in re-establishing post-conflict societies. Women have specific insight into the needs of their societies, which is why their involvement in peacebuilding efforts should be enhanced and the provision of gender-specific funds ensured.

Enhanced coordination, not only within the United Nations system but also with other international partners, is a prerequisite for avoiding duplication and ensuring the efficiency of peacebuilding efforts. It is essential to make maximum use of partners with a comparative advantage on the ground. That is of course very often particularly true of regional and subregional organizations. For that very reason, we need to intensify cooperation with them.

Furthermore, Austria supports the Secretary-General's recommendation to strengthen the authority of senior United Nations leadership on the ground as a means of increasing accountability.

Austria also welcomes the crucial role of the Peacebuilding Commission in addressing a country's post-conflict needs. We would like to underline the necessity of involving the Peacebuilding Commission from the outset. By promoting a coherent and integrated approach that highlights the principles of national ownership and regional cooperation, the Commission provides valuable support for long-term democratic consolidation and sustained economic development. It is therefore best placed to develop an international consensus on peacebuilding, which is necessary to bridge the gap between early stabilization and recovery efforts and longer-term development planning. We attach great importance to building further on the Commission's accomplishments and look forward to the refinement of its working methods and tools in the context of the 2010 review.

To underline our commitment to the work of the Peacebuilding Commission, Austria recently asked to become a member in its country-specific configuration for Sierra Leone. The Secretary-General has mentioned that Sierra Leone is a showcase for cooperation and synergy among United Nations actors on the ground in the framework of peacebuilding. We are therefore happy that our request has met with the Commission's approval. We will actively contribute to its work.

Finally, I would like to thank the Ugandan presidency of the Security Council for preparing the draft presidential statement, as well as to express our full support for it.

Mr. Kafando (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): I would like to welcome your presence among us today, Mr. President, as well as to thank you for providing us an opportunity once again to express ourselves on the important issue of peacebuilding, which is the subject of the report of the Secretary-General (S/2009/304). Before moving to the issue before us, allow me to welcome the Secretary-General's important statement,

as well as the outstanding statements delivered by our special invitees.

We welcome the conclusions of the report of the Secretary-General, which, let us recall, was explicitly requested by the Security Council at the end of its debate held on 20 May 2008 on this same issue. Everyone agrees that the immediate post-conflict period is a decisive moment in providing every opportunity for the success of the peacebuilding process — given, of course, that there a commitment first on the part of national actors, who have the primary responsibility in that regard, then on the part of the international community.

National ownership is therefore crucial if a peacebuilding process is to be viable. In particular, that entails meaningful political commitment on the part of all members of society, including the most vulnerable and marginalized groups. The national dynamics must nevertheless be accompanied by an effort by the international community to provide support, especially to overcome challenges associated with security, socio-economic recovery and relaunching rule-of-law institutions, which cannot be left solely up to post-conflict countries.

We therefore agree with the Secretary-General in emphasizing the crucial duty of the international community to respond appropriately, quickly and effectively in priority areas such as the security sector, providing basic social services, re-establishing State authority and revitalizing the economy. That should be done while strengthening and supporting available local, national, regional and international capacity on the ground. Above all, after clearly identifying a country's specific priority needs, that entails responding appropriately to the root causes of a conflict in order to prevent the recurrence of hostilities.

Given their knowledge of the situation on the ground, the involvement of regional and subregional actors is also a major factor in the success of the peacebuilding process. The participation of the Economic Community of West African States in the peacebuilding process in Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone and that of the Central African Economic Community in the Central African Republic, as well as the peacebuilding experience in Burundi, which was led successfully by Uganda and South Africa, all attest to the importance of that involvement.

The United Nations is called to play a leading role in that joint effort. We would in particular like to emphasize the need to pursue efforts to improve the coordination and coherence of the Organization's actions in order to clearly identify responsibilities and improve the predictability of international support.

We also support the Secretary-General's recommendation concerning the need to establish a programme aimed at improving United Nations action and facilitating that of other participants by making it more coherent and timely. Ultimately, the goal is to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations system to provide expertise and staff who are ready to be deployed quickly to the field to respond to the priority needs of countries emerging from conflict.

Moreover, we would like to commend the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission, which is the best framework for coordinating the efforts of the international community in the area of peacebuilding. We also welcome its efforts to respond to requests from countries emerging from conflict, in particular with regard to mobilizing international financial, material and logistical support. In that regard, we also welcome the commitments made by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

In conclusion, we express the hope that the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary-General and the positive contributions emanating from various discussions at the Peacebuilding Commission will make it possible to redress the shortfalls in the collective response to post-conflict challenges. We nevertheless trust that the commitment and concerted efforts of the entire United Nations system, along with those of the international community, will help to make the peacebuilding process more viable and effective, so as to ensure lasting peace and development in countries emerging from conflict.

We of course also support the draft presidential statement that has been circulated by the delegation of Uganda.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): We are pleased to see you, Mr. Minister, presiding over the Security Council. We thank the Secretary-General for preparing and presenting his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), a document richly deserving of the most careful analysis and consideration.

We share the approach to the criteria for peacebuilding activities set out in the report. We agree that it should be based on the principles of national ownership and capacity-building in countries moving towards peacebuilding, together with the development of a peacebuilding strategy as soon as possible after the settlement of a conflict. The task of the United Nations is to coordinate international assistance and ensure coherent synergy and efficiency in the efforts of various international actors.

External assistance to post-conflict countries should be aimed at building their national capacities. The report provides an objective account of the challenges facing peacebuilding activities. Quite rightly, it includes such factors as the ways in which international assistance is fragmented and inadequate, the irrational division of labour among the various participants in the peacebuilding process, and the inadequacies of financial mechanisms.

The drive to enhance the efficiency of United Nations efforts in post-conflict response is hampered by systemic problems that are addressed with great candour in the report. We welcome the fact that the Secretary-General intends to promote initiatives aimed at strengthening the Secretariat's organizational mechanisms and ensuring their coordinated implementation. The report quite rightly states that there should be a single methodology for assessing countries' needs during the post-conflict phase and that national institutions should play the lead role in that regard. We studied with interest the programme developed by the Secretary-General to improve the post-conflict response mechanism, and we consider many of the related proposals to be reasonable and appropriate.

In addition to the establishment of a standby team and rosters of peacebuilding experts, national capacities must be exploited to the utmost and strengthened. We must encourage the creation of rosters and of civilian standby teams by Member States, regional organizations and international financial institutions. The Secretary-General's proposal that such rosters be drawn up at the United Nations level to create capacities for ensuring accountability and reform in our human resources divisions should be submitted for the consideration of Member States, including for an assessment of their financial implications. We support measures aimed at further improving strategic coordination between the United Nations and the World Bank, an important partner of the Organization on peacebuilding issues.

The Peacebuilding Commission plays the primary role within the peacebuilding architecture. It is required to coordinate international peacebuilding activities, mobilize resources and monitor progress in the implementation of national strategies. While we are generally satisfied with the experience accumulated by the Commission in this area thus far, its mechanisms and working methods must be further adapted and developed. Unfortunately, the report does not devote sufficient attention to the Commission per se, although the time is ripe to develop proposals to improve the way in which it functions.

The Commission could be more actively engaged in the processes of peacebuilding and socio-economic transformation currently entrusted to many peacekeeping operations. Given the increasing complexity and multifunctionality of modern peacekeeping mandates, it would be rational to assign United Nations peacekeepers only to initial recovery tasks, and for the capacities of the Commission, regional organizations, international financial institutions and donors to be deployed in the subsequent stages of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Of particular importance is the task of strengthening the organic relationship between the Peacebuilding Commission and the Security Council, particularly on issues on the agendas of both entities. We must also ensure timely exchanges of information between them, as well as a clear division of labour and complementarity. Clearly, this must be done in parallel with the strengthening of the linkages among the Commission, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. We support General Assembly resolution 63/282 on the revision of the terms of reference for the Peacebuilding Fund. It is important to continue to work to increase the Fund's effectiveness and transparency.

We are grateful to the delegation of Uganda for preparing the draft presidential statement on post-conflict peacebuilding, which has our full support.

Mr. Hoang Chi Trung (Viet Nam): At the outset, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on the convening of this important thematic debate. I should also like to thank Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for introducing his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304).

Since the inception of the Agenda for Peace 17 years ago, post-conflict peacebuilding has evolved into an integral part of the collective efforts of the international community to eliminate the prolonged effects of conflicts and to support a smooth transition to lasting peace and sustainable development.

The immediate post-conflict period is critical to addressing a host of opportunities and the challenges of disarming, demobilizing and reintegrating ex-combatants, strengthening the rule of law and security sector reform, promoting inclusive dialogue and reconciliation, supporting the return and reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons, restoring Government functions and jump-starting economic revitalization.

Over the longer term, substantive investments in poverty reduction, hunger eradication, essential public services, employment creation, social parity, institutional capacity-building and the Millennium Development Goals, inter alia, will serve as linchpins in tackling the root causes of conflicts and laying the foundations for nation-building efforts. If those recurring priorities are addressed in a timely manner, the post-conflict journey towards lasting peace, stability and prosperity can be much smoother.

The fast-moving and uncertain post-conflict environment requires dovetailed support and cooperation from the plethora of multilateral agencies and international stakeholders concerned. In recent years, the United Nations has been working diligently to enhance its efficiency and effectiveness through reform efforts related to the pillars of peace and security, development, human rights, humanitarian affairs and international law.

Standing at the very heart of the international peacebuilding architecture, the Peacebuilding Commission, the Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund have played a central role as the dedicated institutional mechanisms for focusing attention, mobilizing resources and improving coherence, while addressing critical gaps, needs and priorities in countries emerging from conflict.

Given the fact that many conflicts have cross-border dimensions, regional and subregional organizations have established support frameworks to bring their comparative advantage in terms of knowledge of specific local conditions to bear on the work of peacebuilding. At this time of global resource constraints, international financial institutions have also worked to align funding decisions behind immediate and medium-term peacebuilding and recovery assistance.

Provided with differing mandates, guiding principles, governance structures and financing arrangements, United Nations agencies and other partners involved early in the recovery of countries that have experienced "hot" periods of crisis are challenged by the overriding need to move forward and to ensure clarity on roles and responsibilities, the rational prioritization and division of labour, shared planning and analysis, stronger partnerships and greater accountability. It is imperative that their efforts be coordinated and integrated so that all available resources can be fully utilized. Simultaneously, any unnecessary overlap or competition must be reduced and economies of scale maintained.

In that regard, we welcome and look forward to further concrete results in the implementation of the Secretary-General's agenda on strengthening and supporting leadership teams in the field, promoting earlier strategic coherence, reinforcing national capacity from the outset, improving the ability to provide rapid and predictable capacities, and enhancing the speed, flexibility, amount and risk tolerance of post-conflict financing.

Even with the best intentions, external assistance to promote and strengthen war-to-peace stabilization processes will likely be regarded as an imposition unless the cardinal principles of respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States are strictly followed and unless beneficiary host countries are given ample space to determine policy options and decision-making in the pursuit of their goals and objectives.

As the legitimate masters and the biggest beneficiaries of peacebuilding, local populations must be empowered and involved in every step of this long-term endeavour. The entrance, implementation and exit of international assistance should be tailored to and driven by the specific needs and priorities of the country in question, with the consent of local parties and within the overall framework of maximally drawing on and developing national ownership, self-resilience and self-reliance.

In this regard, Viet Nam registers its steadfast support for the cause of peacebuilding and stands ready to share its related experience of capacity development and international cooperation with all interested stakeholders.

The President: I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Ebrahim Ismail Ebrahim, Deputy Minister for International Relations and Cooperation of South Africa.

Mr. Ebrahim (South Africa): South Africa wishes to express its appreciation to the Ugandan presidency for organizing this important debate. We also thank the Secretary-General for his report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304).

This debate follows many robust consultations, which sought to create a common plan and strategy to effectively respond to challenges of post-conflict peacebuilding. The establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2005 as an intergovernmental body to advise countries emerging from conflict was a direct response by the international community to address these challenges.

In that regard, South Africa welcomes the fact that the report before the Council was compiled in consultation with the Peacebuilding Commission. While South Africa supports initiatives and programmes that augment the work of the Commission, it is important that the Commission continue to be strengthened and that it remain the focal point of peacebuilding activities, in line with its mandate. Thus, the report of the Secretary-General should be seen as an attempt to strengthen and enhance existing mechanisms within the United Nations and to streamline those outside the Organization in an effort to better respond to the immediate aftermath of conflict.

In his report, the Secretary-General acknowledges that the immediate aftermath of conflict, while challenging, also offers a window of opportunity for the international community to provide basic security, deliver peace dividends, shore up confidence in the peace process and strengthen core national capacities. The Secretary-General also proposes an agenda on how the United Nations can be strengthened in order to respond to the immediate aftermath of conflict and identifies the following areas as priorities: basic safety and security, basic welfare, economic reintegration and support to political processes.

South Africa fully concurs with the Secretary-General that national ownership of the peacebuilding process is critical for confidence-building and strengthening fragile Governments. Our experience in African peace processes, such as those in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Burundi and Côte d'Ivoire, has also shown us that a peace agreement alone is not sufficient to bring stability in the country. Effective communication and inclusive dialogue between national actors and the civilian population are critical in building confidence in the process, which allows for realistic expectations by the population.

Accordingly, it is important that national actors be capacitated in order to meet these expectations. Again, South Africa's engagement in the African peace processes has also shown that lack of due attention to national capacity development has the potential to constrain national actors from taking ownership of their recovery process.

In that regard, South Africa would like to stress the important role that women continue to play in peacebuilding efforts in post-conflict societies.

South Africa believes that regional and subregional organizations have always been an important element of the multilateral system. Many with their own capacities are making a direct contribution to peace and security in accordance with Chapters VI and VIII of the United Nations Charter. For instance, the African Union, with its Peace and Security Architecture, continues to demonstrate the commitment and desire to successfully contribute to the achievement of stability, peace and political solutions in the continent. These organizations also possess a considerable amount of human capacity, which need to be harnessed and utilized effectively in order to augment the capabilities of the United Nations. South Africa's own experience has shown that the use of civilian expertise can be a valuable tool in the immediate aftermath of conflict.

The Secretary-General identifies an agenda for action by the international community on key priority areas, among which is the role of the United Nations. The United Nations possesses enormous comparative advantages, which should be marshalled to provide effective leadership, coordination and accountability,

particularly as relates to its country teams on the ground.

South Africa has always supported the idea of integrated peace missions in view of the interdependence of United Nations efforts in countries emerging from conflict. We believe that this integrated approach will go a long way in maximizing the impact of United Nations responses.

Related to this is the issue of the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment. South Africa is of the view that the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment should be synergized with the Peace-Building Commission. The experience of the past four years has shown that the advisory role of the Commission has been instrumental in assisting the countries on its agenda to develop their national strategy frameworks. South Africa believes that the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment process needs to compliment the work of the Peacebuilding Commission.

With regard to the Peacebuilding Commission, the Commission had demonstrated the ability to deliver effectively on its mandate, notwithstanding the challenges of the past four years. South Africa looks forward to the forthcoming five-year review of the Commission, to take place in 2010, which will be critical in giving an assessment of the Commission's work and of progress achieved so far.

South Africa is of the view that, in order for post-conflict peacebuilding to succeed, it is imperative that immediate, predictable and flexible financial resources be made available. Therefore, forming solid partnerships with institutions such as the World Bank in a sustained manner is vital.

Lastly, my delegation supports the draft presidential statement to be adopted by the Security Council later today.

The President: I now give the floor to His Excellency Mr. Jean Francis Bozizé, Minister Delegate at the Presidency of the Central African Republic in charge of National Defence, Veterans' Affairs, Victims of War, Disarmament and Restructuring of the Army.

Mr. Bozizé (Central African Republic) (*spoke in French*): On taking the floor at this meeting of the Security Council, I would like to start by conveying to the President, to his delegation and to all members of the Council the warmest greetings of the authorities of my country and assurances of their commitment to the implementation of a programme for post-conflict recovery in the Central African Republic.

More than 10 years after the crises in my country, the political and security situation remains an issue of real concern, despite the stability and peace it now enjoys. Today, the authorities face numerous challenges arising from the disruption of the economy, displaced populations and the destruction of infrastructure, which have resulted in impoverishment and suffering.

The restoration of relative calm shortly after the inclusive political dialogue was immediately followed by a wave of violence with the occupation of the eastern prefecture of Vakaga by rebels of the Union de Forces Démocratiques pour le Rassemblement. The reconquest of this region by Government forces was not enough to put a stop to the irredentist dreams of those who were nostalgic for the time of armed uprisings. We thus have seen the re-emergence of armed groups whose real motivation was none other than to satisfy their own thirst for power.

The wounds inflicted by the bloody conflicts on the country remain, for the means of production have collapsed, the social fabric is torn and infrastructures have been destroyed. The fragility of the economy, the precarious state of institutions and political instability make it difficult to implement classic development programmes with any rapidity. At the same time, humanitarian aid is falling off for lack of resources due to the international financial crisis, and the tools at its disposal are not adequate to respond to the country's needs for economic and social recovery.

Thousands of people have been displaced towards more peaceful areas, including outside the country itself. Around 300,000 displaced persons have been counted at several places on the Chadian border, living in a highly precarious situation and lacking drinking water and the barest of necessities.

The Government, after an effort to engage in dialogue with armed groups so as to lessen the population's suffering, has undertaken security sector reform aimed at enhancing the capacity of the defence and security forces within the context of democracy and good governance. The conclusions of this political dialogue provide for an immediate ceasefire, a demobilization of former combatants and their reintegration into civilian life or into the regular army

in order to provide a sustainable solution to the problem of lack of security.

The transition from armed conflict to peace is a complex process that involves making the country secure, protecting the people, reintegrating displaced persons and refugees, rebuilding infrastructure, relaunching the economy, promoting good governance and political dialogue, and restoring the social capital of the country.

Conflicts pose a greater challenge to rehabilitation programmes and make it very difficult to find coherent links between emergency aid, rehabilitation and development, as crises most often follow a pattern of deterioration, escalation, disorder, calm and hope to a reversal of the situation. In spite of the actions of armed persons in the regions I have just mentioned, we look forward to the return of calm.

We need to consolidate what has been achieved through that calm. After the peace agreements with the Government, and although some armed groups may still be reluctant to join the peace process, in a State as fragile as the Central African Republic, the post-conflict rehabilitation programme needs to be launched as soon as possible. It is particularly important to respond both to the urgent humanitarian needs resulting from the conflict and to support a social, political and economic development process that aims at achieving peace and stability. We also need to integrate post-conflict rehabilitation into an overall global strategy.

It is essential that the improved prospects for peace and economic recovery be exploited to encourage all actors to speed up the demobilization of their combatants. The World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme have joined that process, and the initial resources have allowed us to demobilize and reintegrate 7,665 ex-combatants who returned to their communities in 2007.

I would also like to share with the Council a major concern of the Central African Republic authorities. Over the past 10 years, the phenomenon of child soldiers took hold in the Central African Republic, where several hundred children under the age of 18 fought with the armed groups. Children are vulnerable, and perpetual conflict interrupts their education and destroys their future. Rehabilitation in this context consists of restoring their childhood to these young soldiers, porters, messengers, cooks or, in the case of girls, sex slaves. I therefore welcome the fact that post-conflict rehabilitation programmes take the situation of child soldiers and girls into account.

We are confident that several factors may still undermine the post-conflict rehabilitation operations, whose success depends on the relative stability on the ground, a minimum level of security, the soundness of the peace agreements, and the political will of the parties to resolve the conflict. Our willingness to engage in dialogue is clear, however, and we offer as proof of that the many peace agreements signed with various armed groups, the amnesty offered to the leaders, and the holding of the inclusive political dialogue.

The Government insists on an in-depth analysis of the structural causes of the conflict in the Central African Republic, and on the establishment of a general framework for advancing priority sectors and measures. Balanced stabilization measures are required in the political, economic, legal, social, environmental and military spheres in order to harmonize the interdependent objectives of peace and development.

There is obviously the question of the availability of financial resources, which depend in particular on the genuine commitment of the international community to supporting us in the transition from conflict to peace.

I personally am confident that, after this meeting, the foundations will be laid for a post-conflict rehabilitation programme in the Central African Republic. I therefore support the text of the draft presidential statement that has been presented by the delegation of Uganda. I base my hope and optimism on the commitment of the Security Council to contributing to the definitive return and consolidation of peace in my country.

The President: I now call on His Excellency Mr. Mohamed Abdullahi Omaar, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Somalia.

Mr. Omaar (Somalia): First of all, I thank you, Sir, for this opportunity to participate in and contribute to the consideration of the way forward for peacemaking and peacebuilding. The Secretary-General's report (S/2009/304) reflects both our experience and our needs. We welcome and support its proposals and recommendations.

Somalia and South Asia are proof that we have no choice but to make peace and to build on it. To take but one example, piracy off the waters of Somalia, based on the absence of a national capacity to enforce the rule of law for 18 years, has impacted and affected the lives of almost every region of the world. Therefore, I believe that disengagement from peacemaking and peacebuilding is not an option at all.

As has been said, peacemaking needs vision and a common strategy. From our perspective and due to our history, the peace that we seek is subregional. For 50 years, the Horn of Africa has been at war in one form or another, and we believe that the wider peacemaking and peacebuilding effort in the Horn of Africa is the only guarantee for the peace that we are working towards in Somalia.

Secondly, our experience shows that peacemaking and peacebuilding are not only parallel and simultaneous, but also incremental. In Somalia, despite the problems, two thirds of the country are peaceful and in the peacebuilding phase. The North and the North-East provide examples of locally grounded initiatives that have developed and grown to that stage.

We are now fully and frankly engaged in the completion of the Djibouti peace process in the remaining third — the southern part — of the country. That can be achieved only by reinforcing both the ongoing political peacemaking process and the security stabilization programme.

Somalis have shown national ownership in the stable parts the North and the North-East and in the Djibouti peace process. We have a three-pronged base for national ownership: the North, the North-East and now the Djibouti peace in the South. That has been achieved at a high cost in human life.

We now believe that the proposals and recommendations of the Secretary-General first, for one, a coordinated and timely response by the United Nations agencies and the international community and, secondly, for the capacity-building of the institutions of the State on the ground are the two most critical factors that need to put in place. In terms of Somalia, those are the two priority areas where we need the international community to complete the cycle and the circle of peacemaking and peacebuilding. That is necessary both for the peacebuilding in the North and the North-East and for the peacemaking in the South, where we are engaged.

On behalf of Somalia and its people, we are ready and we confirm our readiness to work with the Secretary-General, the Council, the Peacebuilding Commission, the World Bank and all United Nations agencies to carry through those two elements — capacity-building, on the one hand, and the coordinated and timely response led by the United Nations agencies, on the other.

The indication and example of the international community's involvement in Somalia, alongside our own peacebuilding and peacemaking efforts, are represented by the initiatives of the Security Council, the Peace and Security Council of the African Union, the African Union Mission in Somalia, and the forces of Uganda and Burundi. Both Burundi and Uganda have gone through the same experiences as us, and I believe that they are the proof that the consistency of the international community can help people on the ground deliver the peacemaking and the peacebuilding that we are discussing here today.

Despite the fact that 18 years have passed in Somalia, the achievements in the North and the North-East speak for themselves and for Somalia. The process is now under way in the southern part of the country, and we believe that we can complete that process and close the current chapter of the history of Somalia.

The President: There are a number of speakers remaining on my list for this meeting. I intend, with the concurrence of the members of the Council, to suspend the meeting until 3.15 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 1.25 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.6165 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6165th meeting

Wednesday, 22 July 2009, 3.15 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Kutesa/Mr. Rugunda/Mr. Mugoya	(Uganda)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Lutterotti
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Hu Bo
	Costa Rica	Mr. Guillermet
	Croatia	Mr. Skračić
	France	Mr. Chatel
	Japan	Mr. Tsuruga
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Mexico	Mr. Vargas
	Russian Federation	Mr. Safronkov
	Turkey	Ms. Erdoğdu
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Harvey
	United States of America	Mr. Gee
	Viet Nam	Mr. Nguyen Luu Hai

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-41816 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting resumed at 3.20 p.m.

The President: I wish to remind all speakers, as I indicated at the morning session, to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are again kindly requested to circulate the texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I now give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdelaziz (Egypt): At the outset, I would like to express the gratitude of my delegation for the convening of this important open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding to discuss the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), prepared in response to the Security Council presidential statement of 20 May 2008 (S/PRST/2008/16), and I would like to extend my thanks and gratitude to the Secretary-General for presenting his report.

As I am sure that the Council presidency and members are aware, the first part of my intervention will be on behalf of both Egypt and Ireland, the co-chairs of the meeting entitled "Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Contemporary Challenges and the Way Forward", convened by the Governments of Egypt and Ireland in Cairo on 18 and 19 May 2009. The meeting touched on many of the issues contained in the report of the Secretary-General under consideration today.

Egypt and Ireland took the initiative to convene the Cairo meeting to engage senior officials from all regional groups in a discussion on the contemporary challenges and opportunities in peacebuilding and on possible solutions to those challenges. The Cairo meeting took place against the backdrop of emerging lessons and experiences in peacebuilding from the four countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission: Burundi, Sierra Leone, Guinea Bissau and the Central African Republic, as well as other countries emerging from conflict. Another important factor for the meeting was the forthcoming review of the Peacebuilding Commission, Peacebuilding Support Office and the Peacebuilding Fund in 2010, in accordance with the founding resolutions of the Commission.

The meeting emphasized the importance of addressing the underlying social and economic causes of crises, enhancing coordination and cooperation among regional organizations and institutions and donor countries, and assuring the significance of national ownership and the need to build confidence at the subnational level. The importance of capacity-building — which should be country-specific and tailored to the needs of the country in question — was underscored, as was the need to build institutional capacity, particularly outside of the capitals, and the need for international actors to reduce the administrative burden on local actors.

It was also highlighted that there should be an effective and coherent international response to peacebuilding, coordinated by the United Nations, and that the United Nations must not be a substitute for the Government in exercising its functions and responsibilities, but should support and strengthen the Government's capacity to effectively address the challenges it faces.

Participants stressed the role of the Peacebuilding Commission and the important role of the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme and other partnerships with the United Nations. They addressed the lack of consistent international support and funding in critical areas, the need for more simplified donor procedures that would enable quick gains and more flexible funding, would reduce time frames for disbursement of funds and would encourage diaspora remittances.

The meeting also highlighted the important role of regional organizations in supporting peacebuilding efforts, both in terms of political support and in developing regional peacebuilding capacities. It emphasized that the United Nations should continue to strengthen partnerships and create greater synergies with regional organizations to better support countries emerging from conflict. It was recognized that some regional organizations lacked the appropriate capacity to play their potential role, and donor organizations were therefore encouraged to support them.

In that regard, I would like to inform the Council of Egypt's initiative to strengthen the peace and security structure of the African Union within the framework of the European Union-African strategic partnership. The aim of this initiative is to operationalize and develop the post-conflict

reconstruction and development framework of the African Union through the establishment of a regional centre in close institutional collaboration among the African Union, the United Nations and other international and regional organizations.

In general, the Cairo meeting provided a valuable opportunity for Member States to discuss and exchange views on matters of crucial concern, and we — Egypt and Ireland — are glad to see that many of those elements were taken into consideration in the preparation of the report of the Secretary-General.

Commenting in my national capacity on the report of the Secretary-General, I would like to commend the Secretary-General and his team for preparing the comprehensive report and to express Egypt's support for the ideas and conclusions reflected therein, in particular the emphasis on strengthening national capacity and ensuring that it is part of an entry strategy and not merely the basis for an exit strategy, the necessity of respecting the principle of national ownership, and that peacebuilding efforts must be anchored at the country level, with support and guidance from the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Security Council, the Peacebuilding Commission, the United Nations system at large and Member States. It is national leaders who can ensure that vision, strategy and decision-making respond effectively to the realities on the ground. Therefore, the United Nations is expected to play a leading role in the field, by facilitating engagement between national and international actors and among international actors, without prejudicing the role of the Peacebuilding Commission.

While we agree with the agenda set by the Secretary-General in the report to strengthen the United Nations contribution to a more rapid and effective response in the immediate aftermath of conflict, there is still a need for clarification concerning some of the issues reflected.

First, the report gives the impression that the Security Council is the major player when it comes to peacebuilding efforts in the immediate aftermath of conflict — for example, paragraph 14. At that time the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council should play an equal role. Secondly, all aspects of the matters of the pool of civilian experts and the standing capacities should be further discussed in detail. I propose in that regard that the Secretary-General present a comprehensive report, which could be used as basis for discussions among Member States. Thirdly, enhancing the United Nations leadership team on the ground and the steps undertaken by the Secretary-General, as enshrined in the report, to strengthen the accountability of the Special Representatives are matters that need further discussion and elaboration.

Fourthly, the section of the report relating to the role of the Peacebuilding Commission did not include specific proposals aimed at strengthening the role of the Commission through making it more flexible and efficient in the immediate aftermath of conflict, rather than recommending that the Security Council consider how the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission could contribute to its work during the early phase of the Council's consideration of a situation. That recommendation, though it could lead to increasing the role of the Peacebuilding Commission, could, on the other hand, also lead to increasing the domination of the Council over the work of the Commission vis-à-vis the role of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. Thus, there is a need to further discuss that proposal to ensure that it will not affect the institutional balance between the principle organs of the Organization.

Fifthly, there should be a clear understanding of the interrelationship between peace consolidation activities in the immediate aftermath of conflict, particularly the relationship between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, from all aspects, including the financing of those activities.

In conclusion, my delegation would like to express our appreciation to you, Mr. President, for convening this meeting and to the Secretary-General for presenting his valuable report, with the wish that the United Nations would benefit from it through strengthening its response in the immediate aftermath of a conflict.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Burundi.

Mr. Gahutu (Burundi) (*spoke in French*): It is a pleasure and great honour for me to take the floor before the Council for a discussion on the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding after a conflict (S/2009/304). I wish the President of the Council every success. I also welcome and congratulate the Secretary-

General and thank him for the relevant, wise and diverse advice given in his report.

Given that my country is emerging from a conflict that lasted more than decade, our Government fully supports the guiding principles set out in the report. Although all these principles are closely linked and interdependent, my delegation stresses the importance of some in particular, beginning with the principle of national ownership.

Peacebuilding efforts belong essentially to the countries concerned. The United Nations and the international community should play a catalytic support role in that respect, and contribute to strengthening national capacity as soon as a ceasefire agreement has been signed.

With respect to leadership, we endorse the Secretary-General's proposal to create a high-level mechanism to ensure good United Nations leadership on the ground and to support country teams.

With respect to coherence, restoring, keeping and building peace and post-conflict reconstruction should go hand in hand. That will require the participation of all entities of the United Nations system.

Following a conflict, challenges are always immense and varied. Each situation has its own specific features, and the means for establishing peace are very different in each instance and each area. This debate is taking place at a time when the peacebuilding process in Burundi has seen significant progress in most areas, which is likely to stabilize the country once and for all. We note, for instance, the establishment of the Independent National Electoral Commission; the comprehensive implementation of the political agreements between the Government and the former rebel movement Parti pour la libération du peuple Hutu-forces nationales de liberation, which is now a political party; the commitment of the Government of Burundi to a policy to demobilize and reintegrate repatriated persons; and other examples.

In the area of good governance, the culture of dialogue between national partners is being promoted through sessions and workshops throughout the country.

In the area of security, the professionalization of the defence and security forces and the disarmament of civilians continue.

The regional dimension of security has not been neglected. The ministers of defence of the countries of the Economic Community of the Great Lakes Countries recently reaffirmed their determination to fight the negative forces at work in the subregion and to guarantee the security of our common borders.

With respect to the rule of law and the fight against impunity, my delegation is pleased to announce that consultations with a view to implementing transitional justice began on 14 July. The settlement of land disputes continues, and the Government has adopted a national land policy and a new land code adapted to the current situation.

In the light of the challenges ahead, the peacebuilding process in Burundi requires additional inputs with respect to our priority peacebuilding plan. Many imponderables, including the world financial, energy and food crises, have called all our initial financial forecasts into question. The Government of the Republic of Burundi is still awaiting the implementation of the "Marshall plan" for Burundi proposed by the Peacebuilding Commission last year, requests once again the disbursement of funds pledged by its partners at the roundtable of May 2007, and thanks those that have already honoured their commitments.

The Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi is under way, uniting the Government, the Peacebuilding Commission and national and international partners around a set of common peacebuilding objectives. In general, current trends, achievements and commitments reveal that sound progress has been made in all areas related to peacebuilding. Burundi once again thanks the Secretary-General for his report and his ongoing support for the peacebuilding process in my country.

The President: I give the floor to the representative of Canada.

Mr. McNee (Canada): I thank you, Sir, for convening this important debate. Let me also join others in thanking the Secretary-General for his important report (S/2009/304) and warmly welcome his personal commitment to peacebuilding. I should also like to thank the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for their insightful contributions earlier in the day.

Canada has a long history of contributing to United Nations peacekeeping and peacemaking. That underpins Canada's strong commitment to peacebuilding, which is also reflected in Canada's chairing the country-specific configuration of the Peacebuilding Commission on Sierra Leone.

In that vein, we welcome the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict as an important step forward for peacebuilding at the United Nations. The report is a call to action that points to areas in which the United Nations and the international community have been either unresponsive or disjointed.

Over the past decade, the international community has come to recognize that the fragility of States in the immediate aftermath of crisis represents both a central development challenge and a potential threat to global stability. Failure to adequately address the early recovery needs of fragile States threatens to deepen poverty, increases the risk of a relapse into violence, and poses real threats to regional and international stability.

At the same time, attention to the early recovery agenda does not and must not occur in a vacuum. In this regard, it is significant that this debate comes after the recent publication of the Secretary-General's report on conflict mediation (S/2009/189) and during ongoing discussions about the future of United Nations peacekeeping.

The benefits of investing in peacebuilding are increasingly clear, and Sierra Leone is an excellent example of the real progress that is possible when the international community works in unison to support strong national leadership.

Peacebuilding is a complex, multifaceted task. While the focus of peacebuilding will vary from case to case and across time, the key pillars remain the same. The first is restoring the capacity of the State to provide public goods to its citizens, including justice and the rule of law, basic social services and an enabling economic environment. The second is rebuilding the legitimacy of the State by ensuring the democratic accountability of political leaders to their citizens. The third challenge is to bring about social reconciliation through proactive efforts to heal the wounds left by conflict. Fourthly, rapid economic revitalization must provide jobs and a future to weary populations and ex-combatants. The final and perhaps most important component is visionary political leadership that puts the interests of the country and its people above all else.

Given this context, the report's critical contribution is to emphasize cooperation, coordination and coherence. International actors must pursue common priorities based on an agreed assessment of the situation and a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities. Special effort must be made with the World Bank to clarify respective responsibilities for core peacebuilding sectors. Strengthening leadership teams in the field is an important step towards improving the United Nations contribution. Canada is also encouraged by the emphasis placed on the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment as a unified and inclusive assessment tool.

Establishing durable peace and prosperity is difficult without a functioning State. Building peace is the primary responsibility of national actors. Canada welcomes the recommendations of the report to urge an initial assessment of existing national capacity, bolster capacity for development efforts, and support national oversight of international assistance. Canada also urges peacebuilding actors to consider how the expertise resident in diaspora communities can be better mobilized during post-conflict recovery. During this critical period, more can be done to utilize the strengths of regional organizations, and to encourage greater South-to-South cooperation in support of peacebuilding.

This raises an important issue, that is, timely access to effective technical assistance. The Secretary-General's report (S/2009/304) offers useful recommendations for improving support to United Nations personnel in the field. Existing experience with models such as the Standing Police Capacity, the Mediation Support Unit, and the Justice Rapid Response mechanism should also be applied to other areas of need. Closer cooperation with regional and subregional organizations also offers great promise. The international community should also re-examine how bilateral and multilateral civilian response mechanisms such as expert rosters can be better coordinated and respond more quickly to crises.

(*spoke in French*)

The Secretary-General has identified core peacebuilding objectives, including support for basic

security, political processes, essential services, governance and economic revitalization.

Questions of transitional justice and national reconciliation are central for post-conflict peacebuilding. Local populations must have access to formal and informal structures that facilitate communal healing and address abuses committed during the conflict. An effective justice system is also critical for fostering accountability, building trust in national institutions and establishing basic security. Above all, international assistance must help establish legal institutions that embrace transparency and respect for human rights. In this respect, Canada warmly welcomes the report's emphasis on the full participation of women and children in the peacebuilding process and on the protection of their human rights.

Improved financing is crucial. The creation of the Peacebuilding Fund was an important step in this area, and work is also under way in the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), to clarify best practices in post-conflict assistance. Canada also welcomes both the recent revision of the Peacebuilding Fund terms of reference and the Secretary-General's recommendations for the Fund. Rapid and flexible financing now may help prevent the need for more expensive interventions later.

The report also has significant implications for the Peacebuilding Commission. In our opinion, the Commission remains underutilized, and it is important to reconsider its role in the immediate post-conflict period. Greater ambition with respect to the nature and scope of the work of the Commission is warranted. The Commission has the potential to be a central and effective actor with respect to the prioritization, coordination and support of peacebuilding strategies. We should not be willing to settle for less.

In conclusion, it is now up to the United Nations system to implement the recommendations in the report. It will be important to provide regular updates to Member States on progress being made. In other areas — notably national capacity-building, civilian rapid response and financing — Member States must also take the lead. As a committed member of the Peacebuilding Commission and a major donor to the Peacebuilding Fund, Canada stands ready to support these efforts.

The President: I now call on the representative of Sweden.

Mr. Lidén (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the countries of the stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova and Armenia, align themselves with this statement.

Let me begin by thanking the Secretary-General for his timely report (S/2009/304).

During the past decade, the international community has increasingly been called upon to prevent States from collapsing, fracturing or falling back into conflict. The task we are confronted with is often that of assisting in building functioning State structures in areas torn by political strife and the legacy of violence. Over the years we have learned important lessons, and the report of the Secretary-General provides an opportunity to further strengthen the peacebuilding capacity of the United Nations. Many of its important recommendations need to be urgently implemented. We look forward to the Secretary-General's continued engagement and to his commitment to this important agenda.

The report rightly focuses on the immediate aftermath of conflict. We know from experience that this is a particularly vulnerable and critical phase of peacebuilding, characterized by fragile security conditions, severe humanitarian and human rights needs and significant political uncertainty. For the international community, it is a phase where our ability to deliver assistance is put to a difficult test.

While a basic level of security is vital to achieving peaceful development, all aspects of peacebuilding must be considered from the beginning of the process. The successful disarmament and demobilization of former combatants requires a framework in which those people can be reintegrated. Alongside the deployment of peacekeepers, efforts must be made to stimulate economic recovery, support the provision of basic services and restore the rule of law, good governance and respect for human rights.

The central challenge is to build the structures of functioning State institutions. That process requires the

participation of all relevant stakeholders. National ownership is essential, as underlined in the Secretary-General's report. Special efforts should be made to reach out to women, youth and minority groups at risk of exclusion.

A coherent strategy among international actors in field operations is crucial in order to effectively support national processes. Unfortunately, such coherence is often lacking. The European Union supports the Secretary-General's recommendation on the need for an effective and accountable United Nations leadership on the ground, empowered to lead immediate international efforts in support of national authorities. A common set of priorities is necessary to bridge the gap between early stabilization and recovery efforts and longer-term development planning. Mechanisms for more effective monitoring, evaluation and adjustment of strategies also need to be developed.

The European Union welcomes the emphasis in the report on joint needs assessment, planning and support. Ways must now be found to put this into practice. We look forward to the recommendations on the integrated task forces and on Headquarters support to Resident Coordinators and United Nations country teams.

We echo the Secretary-General's call for greater clarity on the roles and responsibilities of core peacebuilding actors, both within the United Nations and between the Organization and the World Bank and other international actors. Those designated as lead agencies bear a special responsibility to make the appropriate investments in order to provide timely and predictable support. Those arrangements should be subject to regular review.

We have been encouraged by the positive assessment of the Standing Police Capacity and would welcome the further development and expansion of rapidly deployable civilian capacities to other areas pertaining to the rule of law. We look forward to the proposed overall review on how the United Nations can help broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts, particularly from affected regions and from the South. In that context, the European Union would also like to stress the important role of women in peacebuilding, as outlined in resolution 1325 (2000).

The Peacebuilding Commission has existed for three years. It is unique in its membership structure, its involvement of civil society and its country-specific approach. The strategic potential of the Commission lies in its ability to stimulate coordination, mobilize resources, maintain a spotlight on countries emerging from conflict and provide advice to all relevant bodies of the United Nations system. As suggested by the Secretary-General, the European Union would like to see the Commission's advice be more proactively considered. The 2010 review will offer an important opportunity to learn from the first years of operation and to make appropriate improvements. It is also essential that the Peacebuilding Support Office be utilized to its full potential. To that end, the role of the Office should be clearly defined.

Access to timely and flexible funding is often one of the main challenges to maintaining the momentum in a peace process immediately after the conclusion of a peace agreement. The European Union welcomes the Secretary-General's recognition of the need to strengthen the role of the Peacebuilding Fund in the early stages of peacebuilding. We must strive towards a Peacebuilding Fund that sets an example by providing seed funding to bridge the gap between conflict and recovery at a time when other funding mechanisms may not yet be available.

Over the past decade, the European Union has gradually enhanced its capacity to support efforts to secure peace in war-torn areas around the world. Today, the European Union is one of the main contributors to peacebuilding activities, working closely with the United Nations, the African Union and other actors in those efforts. The continued strengthening of those partnerships, particularly with the United Nations, is a key priority for the European Union.

The report of the Secretary-General provides many useful recommendations for strengthening the peacebuilding capacity of the United Nations. It is fully in line with the appreciated efforts of the Secretary-General to enhance the overall coherence, effectiveness and accountability of United Nations operations in the field. The European Union is committed to supporting that agenda for change in all relevant intergovernmental forums as well as at the country level.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand.

Mr. McLay (New Zealand): New Zealand joins others in thanking you, Mr. President, for convening

this special debate. We also thank the Secretary-General for his report (S/2009/304) on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict — a report that confirms the critical role of the United Nations in addressing the many gaps in the international response to conflict situations.

The report rightly focuses on the critical period immediately after conflict, when virtuous cycles must be set in motion to lay foundations for lasting peace. So often, however, we have failed in that, with nearly 30 per cent of all conflicts that ended in negotiated settlement resuming within five years.

Time is of the essence in the immediate post-conflict period. A fragile peace can quickly unravel if peace dividends are not quickly apparent. The availability of expert teams that can deploy and begin work at very short notice is an essential bridge to a fuller and more coordinated response.

The pace of deployment to missions such as the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur, where less than 35 per cent of international civilian posts had been filled a year after its establishment, and the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad, which had first-year vacancies of 91 per cent, is of great concern. Those are stark and depressing numbers. They help make the case for civilian stand-by capacity and for United Nations human resources management reform.

We were pleased that the report also acknowledges that the United Nations must improve its coordination, both internally and with national and international actors. The delivering as one philosophy must underpin United Nations peacebuilding efforts, just as it must in any other area. United Nations country leaders — the people on the ground — need greater powers and support from Headquarters to achieve their most immediate, and invariably urgent, objectives. Competent appointees, with well-defined delegations given the freedom to act quickly and decisively, could save lives, save time and save infrastructure and institutions essential to the peacebuilding process.

The report also recognizes the need for rapid assessments to determine both existing capacity and the most immediate demands for external support. Capacity development, where it is needed, should not be part of an exit strategy; it should begin straight away.

New Zealand follows the work of the Peacebuilding Commission with considerable interest. Its composition, objectives and working methods offer significant promise. But, despite that, we have yet to see concrete results. We therefore welcome the Secretary-General's consideration of how it might better realize its potential, including channelling its resources and promoting greater coherence.

New Zealand favours an integrated approach to addressing the underlying causes of conflict, with the participation of security, diplomatic, development and local actors. We commend the report for emphasizing the importance of local context in developing a peacebuilding strategy.

New Zealand has been a significant contributor to peacebuilding activities that have made a tangible difference on the ground. The Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands promotes long-term stability, security and prosperity by supporting improved rule of law, more effective, accountable and democratic government, economic growth and enhanced public-service delivery. We also adopt an integrated whole-of-government approach to our contributions in Timor-Leste and Afghanistan.

The image of the Blue Beret interposed between previously warring parties has become one of the Organization's successes. But the benefits of peacekeeping, ceasefires and truces can be quickly lost without the next stage, namely, that of peacebuilding, which makes short-term peace sustainable by fostering democracy, leadership, justice, reconciliation, human rights and economic and social development.

New Zealand is committed to working with the United Nations and others to ensure more durable solutions to preventing future conflict. The United Nations must remain as committed to peacebuilding as it is to peacekeeping. One is immediately important to end conflict and save lives; the other is absolutely necessary to prevent the resumption of conflict and to rebuild lives and societies. History will judge not only how we achieved the first, but also how we sustained the second.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Quinlan (Australia): I thank you very much, Mr. President, for the opportunity to speak today on

this vitally important topic. I know that the time is short, so I will summarize my statement.

Australia welcomes the report (S/2009/304) of the Secretary-General, as have others today. Post-conflict peacebuilding is a key challenge of our time. The Secretary-General's leadership is critical to advancing United Nations efforts to address that challenge. His report provides important guidance to all our efforts to improve our response in the aftermath of conflicts.

We fully endorse the principle that peacebuilding following a conflict is the responsibility of the Government of the affected country. There must be local ownership of all efforts. At the same time — and this is not a contradiction — stronger and better-resourced United Nations leadership on the ground will result in better outcomes for the partner country. To improve analysis, planning and coordination, for example, the role of the resident coordinator's office should be strengthened. We also welcome the recognition that there should be a commensurate increase in the accountability of senior United Nations leadership.

We need to recognize the importance of the security-development nexus and to ensure an integrated approach among the various mission elements. We would argue that the importance of effective civil-military-police relations needs to be a key consideration for those taking leadership roles in missions and also in the training and preparedness of deployed civilians.

We welcome the report's acknowledgement of the role that local and traditional authorities and civil society have in recovery and development. Australia's experience in the Pacific, like New Zealand's, has demonstrated the importance of supporting traditional leadership — including those outside the formal State apparatus — in recovery efforts.

We also welcome the report's emphasis on the needs of women and girls. The early post-conflict period provides an opportunity to consolidate new leadership and employment roles that may have been taken on by women during the period of the conflict.

In terms of the international architecture, Australia welcomes the enhanced cooperation framework recently agreed between the World Bank and the United Nations.

With regard to deployable civilian capabilities, we in Australia are in the process of developing such a capability. We look forward to cooperating with the United Nations and others in undertaking a comprehensive review of how to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts and improve their interoperability.

In conclusion, I should to thank you again, Mr. President, for the opportunity to participate in this debate, to reiterate our gratitude to the Secretary-General for the important report that has brought all together and for the valuable ideas that he has shared with us, and finally, to underline our willingness to keep working to improve all our efforts in this area.

Mr. Gutiérrez Reinel (Peru) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like at the outset to highlight the fact that the Security Council scheduled this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding shortly after the recent submission of the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) to the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission and, in particular, shortly after the conclusion of the high-level Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development.

That timing is significant because Peru believes that, in the current context of financial crisis, we must make efforts to prevent peacebuilding processes from being affected. We must do everything possible to ensure that early recovery processes in post-conflict States are maintained and, in this context of crisis, even strengthened. It is well known that those processes face a range of problems that hamper their implementation, such as the lack of infrastructure in countries benefiting from cooperation and the lack of trained cooperation personnel owing to the working and security conditions in post-conflict countries, as well as the slow distribution of funds.

From that perspective, my delegation considers that there are a number of steps that should be taken immediately to strengthen the current peacebuilding processes. These include placing priority on improving the institutional capacity of Governments. That is fundamental, because national actors are the real protagonists in developing the work and the implementation of peacebuilding processes.

With regard to the very nature of conflicts, notwithstanding certain similarities in the economic

and social factors that may be observed in some, every conflict has its own internal and external dynamics, as well as its own ethnic, tribal, constitutional or historical referents. That means that no two cases or relevant groups of actors are alike — hence the complexity and great sensitivity of the management and design of strategies for peacebuilding processes.

Therefore, such processes require designs that improve the division of labour so as to promote effective management in the implementation of projects, the greater involvement of women as important actors in any process, and a diffusion of decision-making throughout the structures of cooperating organizations in order to ensure better effectiveness in project implementation.

Such clear and concrete measures would strengthen the management capacities of all actors involved in peacebuilding processes. In particular, they would help to attain an objective that is an integral part of peacebuilding processes — strengthening the institutionality of the State. As we have seen, that is a process whose aspects are two sides of the same coin and thus interconnected. Therefore, actions should be aimed at promoting both the peacebuilding process and the State-building process, not only simultaneously but in parallel.

In such an exercise it is important, in the light of the prognosis set out in the report of the Secretary-General, that a series of actions be taken to effectively bridge the strategic gap between weak institutional capacities and delayed project financing, without neglecting work in three areas that have a direct bearing on the peacebuilding and the State-building processes — governance, security and development — seeking a fair balance that avoids giving one area pre-eminence over another.

With respect to international cooperation, my delegation believes that, as a matter of priority, it should be channelled towards strengthening the political system and conflict settlement, the training of civilian teams and the design and implementation of projects that will have a swift social impact, which is crucial in order to gain the support of the local population. To that end, financial institutions, including the World Bank in particular, are natural allies in peacebuilding efforts and essential to their success.

All of this involves a medium- and long-term commitment, with the participation of the international community and the full agreement of the State concerned. It may be of several years' duration, in many priority areas and, in some cases, quite far-reaching. A strategic vision of the peacebuilding process is required to that end. It is thus essential to build an alliance among the political, social, educational and economic powers of the State and the relevant international actors.

To the society involved in peacebuilding processes, it should be made clear that international cooperation is aimed at strengthening the exercise of its sovereignty, with full respect for international law and the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, but that such cooperation has a time frame and must follow an agenda with clearly defined objectives and specific goals that will ensure its viability.

I should like to conclude by highlighting the important work accomplished thus far by the Peacebuilding Commission, by reaffirming Peru's constructive support for the leadership of the United Nations and the Commission in the work being done in peacebuilding processes, and by emphasizing my country's full readiness to contribute decisively to those efforts.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Morocco.

Mr. Loulichki (Morocco) (*spoke in French*): Today's Security Council debate on post-conflict peacebuilding is of crucial importance; the subject merits follow-up and further comprehensive work. It is significant, Sir, that this debate is taking place under the presidency of a noble son of our continent, Africa, which continues to be a stakeholder in international peacebuilding efforts.

The recent report of the Secretary-General on this theme (S/2009/304) contains reflection, analysis and forward thinking about how to fill the gaps and make United Nations efforts more effective and better adapted to the needs of countries affected by conflict. Let me draw four fundamental elements from this rich report which in my delegation's view are of particular importance.

First, peacebuilding efforts should be launched as soon as a peace agreement is signed and should be integrated into the implementation of peacekeeping

operations. Such an approach would enable the international community to respond in good time to the priorities of countries emerging from conflict, help those countries to implement the peace agreements they have signed, create peace dividends that can calm populations and help restore trust.

Secondly, national ownership — encompassing both Government and civil society — of the peacebuilding process is fundamental. When the Government or authorities of a country emerging from conflict takes ownership of the process of defining and implementing peacebuilding strategies, it becomes engaged and takes responsibility for the success or failure of the process. But national ownership, however necessary, is not enough. The contribution of the international community is also needed, including that of the international financial institutions, through financial and technical assistance and capacity-building.

Thirdly, there is a need for predictable, rapid and flexible financing for the implementation of peacebuilding strategies. Here, we hope that the recent review of the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund will make it possible to ensure flexibility and speed in the timely disbursement of funds, as well as their optimal utilization.

Fourthly, the international community's activities in the field require coherence and coordination, with a view to producing the desired outcome. In that regard, the competencies and experience that the United Nations has gained in this sphere enable the Organization to assume a leadership role in channelling international action that responds to the needs of the society in question.

I said that I would mention four elements, but a fifth is extremely important as well: the role of regional actors in the creation of conditions conducive to peacebuilding in countries emerging from conflict. You, Mr. President, are well placed to see the very valuable contributions made by neighbouring countries and regional groupings. Experience continues to show that the contributions of neighbouring countries and regional or subregional groupings can make or break a peacebuilding endeavour. The special contribution of such regional actors is extremely important: they should be involved in a constructive way, to bring about peace, stability and regional cooperation.

The report of the Secretary-General rightly emphasizes the importance of economic recovery, which should be integrated into other peacebuilding tasks such as security sector reform; rule of law, including the protection of human rights; bolstering State authority; and transitional justice.

In conclusion, I stress the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission. I have been participating in its work for some eight months, and I have seen the tremendous work the Commission is doing; it is pragmatic and invaluable for the countries concerned. Since it became operational, the Commission has played an extremely important role by designing integrated peacebuilding strategies, adopting a country-specific approach to the States on its agenda, promoting integrated strategies and mobilizing resources. The role of the Peacebuilding Commission should be enhanced and better integrated into the architecture of the United Nations system and its partners, including through the promotion of regular interaction and productive cooperation between the Commission and the Security Council.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Germany.

Mr. Matussek (Germany): I would like to join my colleagues in thanking the Secretary-General for his timely and valuable report (S/2009/304). I would also like to thank the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission, Ambassador Muñoz, for his very comprehensive briefing.

Germany fully supports the statement of the European Union presidency to be made by the representative of Sweden later and shares its analysis of peacebuilding challenges.

Today more than ever, the international community is facing the challenge of supporting post-conflict countries on their way back to sustainable peace and stability. It is often said that winning peace is almost as difficult as winning a war. The fact that 30 per cent of countries fall back into conflict within five years of a peace agreement underlines the magnitude of this challenge.

The report provides an excellent road map for the way ahead with its numerous recommendations. I would like to focus my statement on three particularly important challenges.

The first issue at stake is national ownership. National ownership is key to all peace building efforts. However, in the immediate aftermath of a conflict, national ownership cannot be taken for granted. There are often insufficient national capacities to fully enable the country to exercise its ownership. Therefore, it is vital to strengthen the national capacity to re-establish the institutions of Government, restore the rule of law, provide basic services and handle other key peacebuilding needs. We also must support the national authorities by establishing a prioritized early strategy to address the causes of each particular conflict.

Secondly, there is need for effective and accountable senior United Nations leadership on the ground. This is a prerequisite to corral the international assistance behind the early national strategy. Thereby we can provide timely and predictable support. To achieve a comprehensive and coherent approach we will need a clear division of labour and responsibilities among the various actors. In particular, we must strive for close coordination between the United Nations and the World Bank.

Finally, there is the timing of international support. We need to rapidly and efficiently lay the groundwork for durable peace and sustainable development. To that end, it is essential for peacebuilding efforts to start as early as possible after a conflict, if possible alongside peacekeeping efforts. The new terms of reference for the Peacebuilding Fund provide enhanced opportunities for faster and more flexible funding for peacebuilding activities in the crucial moments directly after a conflict.

Germany will, in particular, strengthen its national capacities to contribute to international peacebuilding missions. We will also support efforts within the framework of the United Nations and regional organizations to increase the rapidity and efficiency of our response to conflicts.

We look forward to a strengthened role for the Peacebuilding Commission in tackling the challenges ahead. The comprehensive review in 2010 will provide a good opportunity to discuss the Peacebuilding Commission's future role and activities.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): Let me begin, Sir, by expressing my thanks for the opportunity to participate in this open debate which you have convened in such a timely fashion to address the question of post-conflict peacebuilding. This issue is relevant to us, in view of our own experiences since the signing of our Peace Agreements in 1996, with a significant United Nations presence. I wish also to express my thanks to the Secretary-General, Mr. McKechnie of the World Bank and Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, for their presentations, which have undoubtedly enriched this debate.

We welcome the Secretary-General's emphasis on the importance of national ownership, the central idea of his report (S/2009/304). This recognition is, in our view, essential since a firm and lasting peace agenda can be executed only when the main national actors find in it a minimal agenda for compromise and consensus.

At the same time, we find useful the commitment undertaken to promote a coherent and efficient response by the United Nations system. In this regard, we believe it is important to make use of the full potential of the Peacebuilding Support Office, and, to this end, we concur in the importance of clearly defining its role, taking into account the complementarity that it could offer to other Secretariat bodies.

We believe that equal attention needs to be given to the fact that the broader support from bilateral donors and non-governmental organizations should be coherent, coordinated and sustained, and above all complementary to the efforts to build confidence in the peace process. That is particularly critical and there is a need to prevent such support from exacerbating the causes of conflict or from generating new sources of tension, as has happened on some occasions in the past.

As regards the proposal on predictable international assistance, we welcome the Secretary-General's commitment to create new systems for recruitment of personnel from neighbouring regions, from countries with similar socio-economic, cultural or linguistic structures, or that have already undergone a process of post-conflict transition.

We appreciate the ideas put forward for an enhanced capacity for rapid deployment of personnel, although this proposal seems complex to us because of the costs that it might involve in terms of keeping professional staff on permanent standby, especially for developing countries. We trust that the proposed

review and the information provided by the Secretary-General on the basis of the relevant provisions of General Assembly resolutions 61/279 and 63/280, will contain mechanisms that are more flexible and that will make it possible to draw upon the capacity of the southern hemisphere.

The report of the Secretary-General reminds us of the importance of responsiveness, harmonization, flexibility and risk-tolerance in the financing mechanisms for the capacity of the system to give an appropriate response. The establishment of multi-donor trust funds and other pooled financing mechanisms for a country seems to us to be a measure that meets these requirements. However, we continue to be concerned about the trend of allocating earmarked funds to the detriment of regular funding, an imbalance which we believe to be the main cause of a lack of coherence in the United Nations system.

As regards the role of the Peacebuilding Commission, we have been interested to see the proposals of the Secretary-General with a view to continuing to improve its advisory function and its function as a forum for a discussion on aid effectiveness and for mutual accountability. The review envisaged for 2010 offers us an important opportunity to learn lessons from the experiences of these first few years and to take decisions on the improvements that need to be made.

We welcome the report's reference to the Economic and Social Council, although we regret the fact that it is limited to the issue of financing for development. That ignores one of the main functions of that organ, which is to coordinate the activities of the specialized agencies and making recommendations to them, especially in the context of the humanitarian segment and the operational activities segment.

Finally, allow me to touch on a matter closely related to today's discussion but not covered by the reflections of the Secretary-General, namely the desirability of initiating peacebuilding activities in countries that are still in conflict, taking into account the importance of effective coordination and mobilization of resources from the peacekeeping stage to the peacebuilding stage.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Brazil.

Ms. Dunlop (Brazil): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to participate in this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. My delegation expresses its appreciation for this morning's briefing by Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission. We also thank the representative of the World Bank for his statement.

Brazil welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). It provides valuable insights on how to improve United Nations effectiveness in post-conflict situations. I would like, in particular, to comment on six aspects mentioned in the report.

First, we appreciate the strong emphasis the report places on country ownership. This principle should be the sine qua non for any strategy for peacebuilding. However, country ownership brings enormous challenges. Governments often lack the human and material resources needed to undertake the most elementary of tasks. But there are no shortcuts. We should spare no effort to strengthen local capacity so that the country concerned can tread its own path towards peace and development.

Secondly, the report correctly acknowledges the importance of regional actors in peacebuilding. Countries from the region usually share linguistic and cultural values and, very often, similar political and economic contexts. They are therefore very well placed to provide assistance. Also, the contribution from the global South should not be underestimated. South-South cooperation in post-conflict peacebuilding offers very promising avenues that have yet to be fully explored.

It is in the light of this perception that we should consider the Secretary-General's proposals for ensuring adequate and timely leadership on the ground. Standby civilian capacity mechanisms could benefit from the contribution of regional actors and developing countries. Their mandate should include, first and foremost, support to domestic institutions. Also, as the report indicates, they should not replace ongoing efforts to improve regular recruitment processes and human resources management.

Thirdly, the Secretary-General noticed that there are recurrent priorities to be taken into consideration in peacebuilding. They encompass a broad range of areas, from the restoration of key State functions to the promotion of economic recovery. Setting priorities

among priorities is indeed necessary. However, peacebuilding is a multidimensional enterprise. Priorities will necessarily contemplate different areas, especially in the fields of security and development, in which coordinated and simultaneous actions are indispensable. It is true that lack of security hampers economic development. But it is also true that peace cannot be sustainable in the midst of misery and despair.

Fourthly, we totally agree that funding is the backbone of peacebuilding. Any strategy, no matter how sophisticated or creative it might be, will have a short life in the absence of adequate financing. That is why we endorse the appeal by the Secretary-General for innovative and more flexible financing schemes, tailored to the specificities of peacebuilding. The Peacebuilding Fund has been extremely useful and will continue to be so under its new guidelines. But it was envisioned as a catalytic tool that needs complementary funding from other sources, on a reliable and continuous basis.

Fifthly, we praise the focus of the report on the immediate aftermath of conflict. Peace dividends should become visible to the population as soon as possible. Early recovery prevents the spiral of instability that could make the situation even more difficult and lead to the resumption of conflicts. Brazil believes the Peacebuilding Commission can also play an important role in countries in the immediate aftermath of conflict, should their Governments so request.

However, it should be borne in mind that many countries where conflict subsided years ago either suffer from donor fatigue or, worse still, have never been able to attain sustained international assistance. That is the case of Guinea-Bissau and the other countries currently on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission. The contribution of the Commission in these cases has been quite valuable, most notably with regard to the galvanization of international attention and the mobilization of resources.

We hope — and this is my sixth and final point — that the Secretary-General's recommendations to the Peacebuilding Commission can serve as a good basis for a comprehensive dialogue on how to enhance the Commission's work even further. Particular attention should be devoted to ways to streamline the Commission in the United Nations system and strengthen its coordination with United Nations bodies and other stakeholders, including regional organizations, the international financial institutions, civil society and the private sector. The 2010 review process will be a golden opportunity to address this and other issues.

The President: I give the floor next to the representative of Sierra Leone.

Mr. Davies (Sierra Leone): Mr. President, I had an opportunity to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency when I addressed this body during the recent meeting on the situation in Sierra Leone in respect of the Special Court for Sierra Leone. Let me once again, Mr. President, congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council and express the sincere gratitude of my delegation for inviting us to participate in this debate.

My delegation's appreciation also goes to the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, jointly presented to the Security Council and the General Assembly (S/2009/304). I would also like to thank the Chair of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for their valuable presentations this morning.

The Peacebuilding Commission was established to marshal the resources of the international community and to offer advice and propose strategies for post-conflict recovery, with a special focus on reconstruction, institution-building and sustainable development in countries emerging from conflict.

In order to accomplish these goals, the Committee set itself the following objectives: first, to propose integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery; second, help to ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities and sustained financial investment over the medium to longer term; third, extend the period of attention by the international community to post-conflict recovery; and fourth, to develop best practices on issues that require extensive collaboration among political, military, humanitarian and development actors. Therefore, any consideration of a report presented concurrently to the Security Council and the General Assembly should be gauged by the above parameters, with regard to the attainment of the priorities of the countries on the agenda of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Four years have gone by, and the proposed integrated strategies for post-conflict peacebuilding and recovery and the development of best practices on issues that require extensive collaboration among political, military, humanitarian and development actors have evolved substantially, as spelled out in the report before us. The countries on the Commission's agenda continue to receive the international community's attention. It is very crucial to advance these objectives to the next level and to help to ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities and sustained financial investment over the medium to longer term.

Peacebuilding is a powerful conflict-prevention mechanism both in societies that have experienced violent conflict and in those on the verge of sliding into conflict. However, studies reveal that the United Nations and the international community have tended to invest more resources on conflict resolution and peacemaking than on the preventive aspect.

The consolidation of peace in societies emerging from conflict depends entirely on the efforts and initiatives undertaken to address the immediate aftermath of conflict — a phase characterized by the complete withdrawal of the remnants of arms from communities, the reassimilation of internally displaced persons, refugees and ex-combatants into civil society and the provision of relief. These, in our opinion, rank among the key components required for stabilizing post-conflict situations in order to pave the way for various reform initiatives and long-term recovery programmes.

We must bear in mind that if these factors remain unaddressed, the potential for societies to slide back into conflict can be imminent. It is also worth noting that studies have shown that societies emerging from violent conflict are more likely to relapse into hostilities in the first five to ten years following the end of conflict. Thus a rapid and effective engagement of the above-mentioned components can be crucial for the future stability, recovery and the sustainable development of those societies.

On the home front, Sierra Leone has come a long way. Since the end of the war, we have had three general elections, the last of which brought the opposition party, the All People's Congress of President Ernest Bai Koroma, to power. We recently had the quarterly review of the implementation of the mandate of the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone. Leadership of actors on the ground is well coordinated. The numerous strategic frameworks have been completely streamlined in President Ernest Bai Koroma's Agenda for Change. The recently concluded second generation of the poverty-reduction strategy and the Joint Vision of the United Nations country team as a coordination mechanism for partnership collaboration with the Government have been realized.

The recent hiccup in mid-March that tested our resolve for peaceful coexistence as a nation was swiftly addressed by the Government and the Executive Representative of the Secretary-General by encouraging the leaderships of two main political parties to take responsibility for the actions of their supporters. That effort brought the inter-party dialogue back on track and, since then, the situation has normalized.

The high-level event, hosted at the request of the Chair of the Sierra Leone country-specific meeting, the Permanent Representative of Canada, Ambassador John McKee, and the Government of Sierra Leone on 10 June this year, sought to move forward the Sierra Leone peacebuilding agenda by marshalling support for the Government's Agenda for Change and the second phase of the poverty-reduction strategy by announcing the establishment of a $350 million donor trust fund for the implementation of those strategic frameworks. The Government appeals for, and looks forward to, a favourable response now and at the forthcoming Consultative Group meeting, to be held in London in November.

On behalf of the Government of Sierra Leone, I would like to register our sincere appreciation for the continued engagement of the United Nations, our bilateral partners and the international community on Sierra Leone and for the determination to consolidate peace and democracy and to put Sierra Leone on the path to sustainable development.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Uruguay.

Mr. Álvarez (Uruguay) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, allow me to congratulate the Council for having convened this debate on such an important topic. Peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict is crucial in guaranteeing peace, security and the minimal conditions for human development for

millions of people who have emerged or who are emerging from conflict, as well as in preventing such conflicts from reoccurring.

In that respect, Uruguay would like to take this opportunity to highlight certain aspects of the report (S/2009/304) presented this morning by the Secretary-General that we find to be particularly relevant.

Probably the most striking point in that report relates to the need to give greater coordination and coherence within and beyond the United Nations system to peacebuilding efforts. That point, summarized in the need to approach this issue from a comprehensive standpoint that encompasses the various key areas to stabilize a country and to begin to give it concrete steps in its economic and social development, is crucial for the international community's peacebuilding efforts to be effective and sustainable.

In that regard, we are convinced that the Peacebuilding Commission is a key tool to improving the current situation, and we hope that the 2010 review process creates a favourable climate for that body to fully engage in the area of coordination.

In that respect, let me stress that the Peacebuilding Commission is unique in being probably the only intergovernmental forum that brings together developing and developed countries to jointly discuss peacebuilding and reconstruction; that links political aspects, such as those of security and development; that so closely involves itself in specific countries; and that has a level of legitimacy that probably no other body has.

Meanwhile, we fully agree with a number of concepts highlighted in the report, such as the need to strengthen national ownership and to give priority to a country's own needs, which goes hand in hand with strengthening national capacity from the start.

Likewise, we appreciate that issues linked to security, undoubtedly indispensable to providing a minimum framework of stability, be only one area in which the Secretariat has proposed seeking considerable progress in the coming months. Support for governmental institutions that serve essential functions, the reintegration of returnees, early employment generation, the rehabilitation of basic infrastructure and various aspects of economic revitalization are activities of equal priority, without which peacebuilding is not sustainable.

As we have already stated in other thematic debates, it also seems important that dialogue and peace processes be inclusive and representative, and we agree that regional organizations can play a positive role in that respect.

From the standpoint of a developing country that has actively cooperated in peacekeeping as well as in early recovery activities, primarily through valuable human resources, we particularly appreciate the emphasis placed on the need for the United Nations to draw more on/take better advantage of the capacities in the southern hemisphere in order to contribute to the task of peacebuilding. In that regard, we hope to see the realization of the idea put forward by the Secretary-General in the report of creating new systems of outreach to appropriately qualified personnel from developing countries. Uruguay, along with the rest of our region, has valuable human resources to contribute in various areas key to peacebuilding.

Somewhat linked to the aspect mentioned earlier, there is one matter that caught our attention it was not covered properly in the report of the Secretary-General. It concerns the support that military personnel deployed in peacekeeping operations could contribute, precisely in that early period, when there is a transition towards a peacebuilding phase or when both tasks — peacekeeping and peacebuilding — occur simultaneously.

The role of peacekeepers as early peacebuilders must not be underestimated. The support that such personnel can contribute in key areas such as providing security and strengthening the rule of law, including areas such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, as well as security sector reform and even expanding State authority, must be drawn on. The positive effect of quick-impact projects should also be taken into account. There are over 100,000 women and men deployed in 16 missions who can provide a resolute contribution in the early stages of restoring stability.

To conclude, as is clear from the report and this debate, much remains to be done with respect to mechanisms of the management, financing and coordination of peacebuilding. That is only natural, bearing in mind that this Organization has undertaken systematic and institutionalized efforts in this area for

only a short time. For that reason, Uruguay believes that it is extremely timely for all of us to take this opportunity to renew our support to the Peacebuilding Commission and take advantage of the approaching 2010 review to strengthen it and make it an even more effective tool for the Organization.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Norway.

Mr. Brevik (Norway): Norway welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304). We fully agree with the report's emphasis on national ownership and on the need to meet countries' demand for strengthening of national and local capacities.

The role of the United Nations should be to coordinate international efforts. To fulfil this role, the United Nations country team must be able to draw on staff quickly and assign them to appropriate positions without having to engage in time-consuming administrative rules and regulations. Norway therefore supports the recommendation of the Secretary-General to Member States to approve reform packages on human resources.

We also welcome the initiative of the Secretary-General to create a senior-level mechanism at United Nations Headquarters to ensure that the right leadership and support teams are in place as early as possible.

Despite the comprehensiveness of the report, Norway would have liked to see the roles of the various sectors described more fully in the report. We believe that undefined responsibility leads to a lack of accountability. We trust that the work in this area will continue in the time ahead.

Although significant progress has been made in comprehensive strategic planning, there remain serious challenges in trying to coordinate security, political, humanitarian and development efforts in post-conflict situations. The report addresses this fundamental dilemma by stating that the senior United Nations leadership team has the responsibility to ensure strategic coordination and linkages between the relevant frameworks. All parts of the United Nations system need to improve dialogue and coordination and should be provided with incentives to avoid duplication, inefficiency and delays in the commencement of operations. Member States need to take a lead role in requesting and supporting these improvements.

In that regard, Norway commends the steps taken to improve the working relationship between the United Nations and the World Bank with the Partnership Framework Agreement. This is of vital importance and will hopefully improve both the strategic coordination and the collective impact of the United Nations and the World Bank's efforts on the ground.

The Peacebuilding Commission should play a more central role in ensuring that the international community is a more reliable partner to Governments of post-conflict countries. The role of the Peacebuilding Commission in promoting greater coherence and synergies between the different parts of the United Nations system and other partners should be strengthened. It is essential that adequate resources be made available to the Peacebuilding Support Office in order to support the Peacebuilding Commission and administer the Peacebuilding Fund in an efficient manner.

As stated in the report, the Peacebuilding Fund should strengthen its focus on core peacebuilding activities. Thus far, the Peacebuilding Fund has largely supported later-stage peacebuilding activities rather than providing a rapid, flexible and risk-tolerant approach directed at the immediate aftermath of conflict.

The report of the Secretary-General sets out an agenda to strengthen the United Nations response in the immediate aftermath of conflict and the facilitation of an earlier, more coherent response from the wider international community. Successful implementation of the agenda requires political will, prioritization and the alignment of funding from Member States. Let me reiterate Norway's commitment to the reinforcement of the existing peacebuilding mechanisms and our support for the recommendations stated in the report.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of India.

Mr. Singh Puri (India): At the outset, let me thank you, Sir, for scheduling today's debate. We are addressing a topic that we believe is very relevant to the raison d'être of the United Nations. I also welcome the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in

the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304), which underpins today's discussion.

The report collates several significant findings and recommendations. Key among these is the need for a more coherent and effective international engagement during the brief window between the cessation of conflict and the establishment of a peace process, and the more complex process of ensuring that such processes remain on track. There are clearly two levels of intervention in support of a peace process. The first is at the national and local level, and the second is at the regional and international level. Both processes must move in lockstep.

However, that said, there are several elements of detail that require attention. These include the need to ensure that the supporting external interventions focus on delivering a peace dividend, expanding national capacity and ensuring the expansion of basic economic capacity so that surplus labour — especially young people — can be gainfully employed.

Such efforts need to be based on recognition of the complexity of post-conflict scenarios. Not all peace processes and agreements address the underlying causes of conflict. Similarly, not all local actors are untarnished by the rigours of conflict. Yet we need to work pragmatically with the actors and circumstances as we find them, not as we would wish them to be. From that standpoint, it is important to ensure that priority-setting be a local endeavour. It is both politically unworkable and strategically perilous for the international community to involve itself in determining national priorities. Sustainable peace requires genuine national ownership of the process, not a process that is nationally owned only in times of difficulty.

It is therefore essential that from the outset peace consolidation efforts be focused upon expanding the capacity and competence of the local Government to deliver services. Without this, there can be no national ownership or development, and without either there will be no sustainable peace. There is a particular contribution that the nations of the South can make in this context, both with regard to providing training and services and with regard to providing appropriate technologies. These potentialities need to be explored further.

At the same time, there is also a need for greater efforts to align national and international efforts in multilateral forums. Through better alignment and coordination, we can conceivably achieve more coherent interventions and inputs on the ground. This requires better horizontal and vertical coherence. That is to say, we need more coherent efforts by the international community to integrate sometimes disparate efforts in dealing with cross-cutting themes in a peacebuilding context. Too often, the well-meaning efforts of the international community tend to be at cross purposes, thereby undermining the collective effort.

Similarly, vertical coordination is also required, in particular within the United Nations and its agencies and programmes, to ensure that a common objective is matched by a clear road map to that objective. Coordination and consultation between the United Nations and the international financial institutions, especially the World Bank, must also be expanded.

The report clearly recognizes that if the United Nations is to be a lead actor in the process of peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict, more must be done to improve its efficiency. It is of course positive that the report recognizes such lacunae. It is also important that the report implicitly recognizes that of itself; the significant convening power that the United Nations brings to the table is not enough. Thus, section V of the report dwells at length on the means by which the United Nations and its funds and programmes may be able to contribute more effectively to the process. Naturally, as practitioners on the ground will be better able to assess the potential efficacy of such measures, perhaps in time more deep-rooted reform will be required.

I would like to conclude by highlighting the need for further consideration and discussion of the complex issue of post-conflict peacebuilding. We need to be able to frame this debate within a conceptual framework that tries to answer certain larger questions regarding the purposes and principles of international involvement in post-conflict peace consolidation. These include the question of where early recovery fits within the larger continuum of peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and where the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, and from peacebuilding to peace consolidation and development, begins.

We also need to ask ourselves how international investment, both in money and political will, can be

expanded in support of peacebuilding. In that context, there is clearly a need to expand the role of the Peacebuilding Commission and to deepen its strategic relationship with the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Social and Economic Council.

I look forward to a continuing dialogue on this subject in this and other forums within the United Nations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Thailand.

Mrs. Chaimongkol (Thailand): On behalf of the Government and the people of Thailand, I wish to warmly congratulate the delegation of Uganda upon its assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of July. I would like also, Sir, to express our sincere appreciation for your leadership in convening this timely Security Council debate on the very important issue of post-conflict peacebuilding.

Like other delegations that took the floor earlier, the Government of Thailand shares the commitment of the international community to this critical issue and stands ready to work with partners to advance the agenda for the benefit of people on the ground. In this connection, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to share our views on the issue with the Council.

First, Thailand welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) and would like to thank the Peacebuilding Support Office for its commendable work. We agree with the emphasis of the report on early action and national ownership in the peacebuilding process. The report highlights critical gaps in peacebuilding efforts and provides useful recommendations on ways and means to strengthen the United Nations response as well as international cooperation on this matter.

Secondly, Thailand supports the strengthening of United Nations leadership and coordination on peacebuilding. As the largest intergovernmental organization, with specialized agencies spanning a comprehensive set of issues and a close partnership with a variety of civil society organizations on the ground, the United Nations is, we believe, in a unique position to bring all relevant actors on board to ensure more effective coordination and a more coherent response at both the policy level and on the ground in support of the priorities and strategies of all countries concerned. With a common vision and a coherent coordination mechanism among the United Nations agencies, donors and other relevant actors, country-specific needs and priorities would have a better chance of being fulfilled and limited resources would be better utilized.

Thirdly, Thailand is of the view that security and economic challenges must be addressed simultaneously and given equal weight when priorities for peacebuilding are being determined. Security and development are interconnected and cannot be tackled in isolation. It is important to keep in mind that there is no one-size-fits-all solution or formula for rebuilding a society that has undergone conflict. Every situation is unique and the particular dynamics of each case, as well as the competing demands and interests of all parties concerned in a given society, should be taken fully into account when setting a country's priorities and strategies. In other words, the process must be bottom-up to be durable.

Fourthly, to promote national ownership and sustainable peace in the long run, Thailand believes that local expertise and resources should be fully mobilized, while the country's resources management capability should also be strengthened. When international experts are called on to deliver advice and services on the ground, geographical balance and representation should be taken into consideration. And at the start of a peacebuilding process, the relevant actors should have an end goal in sight. It is important to stress that peacebuilding is not a perpetual process, but a supportive beginning to sustainable peace and development.

Fifthly, Thailand believes that regional actors can significantly influence the peace process and that engagement with such key players in peacebuilding efforts is indispensable. Therefore, we encourage closer and more systematic consultations, as well as sharing of experience, between the United Nations and relevant regional partners throughout the peacebuilding process, from the very outset.

We also recognize the potentially positive contribution of South-South cooperation and trilateral partnerships in assisting countries emerging from conflict, bearing in mind the comparative advantage of the sharing of experience between developing countries

or those with similar social, cultural or political structures, with the support of the donor community.

Sixthly, Thailand strongly supports the Secretary-General's recommendation that the Security Council should proactively consider how to more actively utilize the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission in its consideration of post-conflict situations. We also support the Secretary-General in his view that, for countries on the Security Council's agenda, the respective roles of the Council and the Commission need to be seen as complementary and parallel, rather than sequenced in a manner that could diminish the Commission's role during earlier phases where it could add significant value.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate Thailand's firm commitment to peacebuilding and our strong support for a holistic approach to the issue of peace and security. We believe that in the present age of globalization and increasing interdependence, it is imperative to address conflicts comprehensively — both upstream and downstream. Conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding should always be looked at in their totality. We are committed to supporting the work of the United Nations in this regard. We look forward to constructive consultations leading to the review of the arrangements of the Peacebuilding Commission in 2010, with the goal of strengthening its contribution to the effects of peacebuilding.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Pakistan.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): Let me congratulate you, Mr. President, on Uganda's assumption of the stewardship of the Security Council for this month. We appreciate the opportunity to participate in this discussion of the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304).

We thank the Secretary-General for his report, which contains an objective analysis of the challenges and opportunities of post-conflict peacebuilding. While the challenges addressed in the report may not be new, the value-added of this report is the fresh perspective and impetus it could provide on the ways and means of addressing these challenges in a more timely and effective manner. Drawing on past experiences, a closer review of ground realities and expectations and an extensive process of consultations, the report outlines an agenda that can guide and better inform our collective action in forging more coherent, efficient and predictable responses to the peacebuilding needs of countries emerging from conflict.

While the report's focus is on the initial two-year post-conflict period, it is good to note that it addresses a wide range of policy issues and practical tools in a manner that retains the broader and long-term perspective of peacebuilding. But since there is a proven risk of relapse into conflict within the first five years, it is important for the international community to devote particular attention to doing things right in the immediate aftermath of conflict.

It is true that the challenges are immense in that period, but so are the hopes and aspirations of the people affected by conflict, who are determined to seize the opportunity of peace and to turn a new page for a better and more secure and prosperous future. That is what must happen. It is those people who have the greatest interest and highest stakes in peacebuilding. It is therefore only logical that they have full leadership and ownership over the process.

However, since countries emerging from conflict face complex and fragile situations, and most often lack the capacities and resources to overcome the challenges on their own, it is incumbent upon the international community to help them to lay foundations for sustainable peace and development. That partnership is at the heart of successful peacebuilding. It comes as no surprise that the report of the Secretary-General is structured around those central pillars of national ownership, with the good governance and honest and sincere purpose that are essential. That must also include international partnership, with sufficient resources and the will to understand, not dominate.

Today, peacebuilding is an established component of the comprehensive approach to conflict prevention and resolution. It is a direct manifestation of the interlinkage between peace and development. The general principles of effective peacebuilding are well recognized. As the Secretary-General has observed, it entails a common strategic vision based on clearly defined and agreed national priorities, and coherent and concerted action backed by the required capacity and resources aligned with that strategy.

We believe that, in order to succeed, that endeavour must be people-centric, responsible to the

specific needs and circumstances and designed to reinforce their confidence in and support for the peace process. The central objectives of establishing security, promoting inclusive political processes and reconciliation, delivering early tangible peace dividends and building national capacities for governance, economic recovery and development should all be sensitive to that human dimension of peacebuilding.

While there is a fair degree of convergence on the principles and objectives of peacebuilding, the main challenge is to translate it fully into practice. The true test of the Secretary-General's report will be in the implementation of his recommendations. That requires, above all, the political will and commitment, not only of national actors but also of international partners, to stand behind and implement a common strategy, not one that is divergent. While the latter need to demonstrate more understanding and flexibility to align their support with national priorities and to eliminate conditionalities, the former, on their part, also need to inculcate the required responsibility and values of governance that correspond to ownership and infuse confidence among all partners.

The Secretary-General is right in saying — and this is very important — that investment in national capacity-building should be part of the entry, rather than — in that well-known and oft-used phrase — the exit strategy. Priority should be on identifying, tapping and harnessing the civilian capacities available nationally before resorting to regional or international expertise, as required. I would now like to remind my colleagues of what Mr. Brahimi said in this very Council on 20 May 2008.

> "We should have as many international staff as we need to get the job done, but not one single staff member more than that. Our goal in the mission, individually and collectively, should be from the outset to work ourselves out of a job." (*S/PV.5895, p. 10*)

The most ominous gap, however, is in funding and resources. The various recommendations contained in the report aimed at generating rapid, flexible and predictable funding would require cooperation and support from Member States, in particular from donors, as well as enhanced collaboration with the international financial institutions, which have not been so forthcoming to this institution in the past and which would need to show more operational flexibility in the assistance programmes for countries emerging from conflict, considering their plight and special circumstances.

From the point of view of enhancing national ownership and capacity, it should also be very important that most of the funding also be provided through governmental channels. But it would make a lot of sense to devote attention, from the very outset, to mobilizing international resources, especially through better management and the exploitation of natural resources, for the benefit of a country and its people.

Peacebuilding is a complex undertaking involving parallel and coordinated efforts on the security, political, humanitarian and development fronts. The United Nations, with its wide-ranging mechanisms, capacity and expertise, is well-placed to coordinate and lead international action in this field — of course, with the support of other partners, particularly the World Bank.

We welcome the commitment of the Secretary-General to improve the peacebuilding efforts of the United Nations. The Peacebuilding Commission, with its unique composition and specific mandate, has a pivotal role in those efforts. Strengthening the Commission and utilizing its full potential is therefore essential in advancing the peacebuilding objectives of the United Nations. For effective responses in the immediate aftermath of conflict, it would make more sense if the Peacebuilding Commission were engaged from the very outset of the involvement of the United Nations, particularly where integrated peacekeeping missions are deployed. The Commission also has a critical role to play in the follow-up to the Secretary-General's report. Full implementation of the report would also entail the engagement and contribution of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the success of peacebuilding efforts will be gauged eventually by the tangible benefits and results on the ground, not merely by the organizational skill that we have to show here. We hope that this debate, which to us is part of the process that began in the Peacebuilding Commission last week, will contribute to that same objective, which is at the very heart of the Secretary-General's excellent report.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Bangladesh.

Ms. Jahan (Bangladesh): May I also join preceding speakers in thanking you, Mr. President, for convening this important debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, an issue that deserves greater international attention, particularly in the context of the complex and varied challenges faced by countries emerging from conflict.

In the same vein, my delegation would like to commend the report (S/2009/304) of the Secretary-General before us on the issue of peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict. Our appreciation also goes out to the Chairman of the Peacebuilding Commission and the representatives of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank for the important presentations they made earlier today.

We would like to emphasize that the Peacebuilding Commission should have the central role in post-conflict peacebuilding. The Commission, in institutional harmony with the Peacebuilding Fund and the Peacebuilding Support Office, should act as the primary body responsible for the coordination of coherent and integrated peacebuilding activities, as envisaged by the foundational resolutions 60/180 of the General Assembly and 1645 (2005) of the Security Council.

At the same time, we would like to underline the importance of a more cohesive relationship among the Peacebuilding Commission, the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. In the context of the 2010 review of the mandate of the Peacebuilding Commission, we look forward to working closely with all concerned on how to enhance and strengthen that mandate to make it more effective.

My delegation fully supports the emphasis placed in the Secretary-General's report on the principle that post-conflict societies must take charge of their own destiny. With a view to the achievement of that goal, we call upon international partners to align their financial, technical and political support around a commonly agreed national strategy that essentially takes into account national ownership and priorities. We also emphasize the need for all post-conflict strategies and interventions to address the needs of women; young people, particularly ex-combatants; and children, including child soldiers, as the case may be.

We strongly emphasize the need for national capacity-building from the very outset in order to establish sustainable peace so that countries are prevented from relapsing into conflict. In that regard, existing national capacities must be taken into account.

Bangladesh also encourages the involvement of civil society and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in development activities at the local level. We believe that that could, in effect, significantly contribute to the process of achieving sustainable economic growth, leading to sustainable peace and development in countries emerging from conflict.

In that context, I should like to mention that a leading NGO of Bangladesh, with wide-ranging operations and interventions in terms of health, education, agriculture and microfinance development projects, has recently begun to work in the reconstruction processes of post-conflict countries such as the southern Sudan, Liberia and Sierra Leone. The same organization has been making invaluable contributions to the reconstruction of Afghanistan since 2002, amid formidable challenges. That could be considered an ideal example of a successful South-South cooperation and development initiative.

The Secretary-General's recommendation concerning rapidly deployable and skilled civilian capacity deserves detailed examination. Any initiative towards building such capacity should be thoroughly discussed in more inclusive forums, such as the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Peacebuilding Commission.

We reaffirm the importance of a more rapid and flexible funding mechanism, as well as predictable funds. These are of the utmost importance to supporting national and local authorities in delivering a peace dividend at an early stage.

We welcome the Secretary-General's initiatives to streamline coordination among Headquarters, special representatives of the Secretary-General, United Nations country teams, national Governments and the Peacebuilding Commission. While we recognize the need for an extended role for United Nations leadership on the ground in the immediate aftermath of conflict, we would like to emphasize that such efforts should not undermine national ownership of the peacebuilding process. Rather, efforts must be taken to facilitate, promote and complement the country specific capacity building mechanism and ownership of the process.

In that regard, given the evolving scenario of the peacebuilding process, we would stress the need for the further harmonization and consolidation of United Nations-led initiatives, regarding which lessons learned from the Security Council-mandated integrated peacekeeping missions could be taken into account.

Finally, we strongly emphasize the need for greater synergy between peacekeeping operations and peacebuilding activities, as many of the important elements of peacebuilding process — such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security sector reform and the rule of law — emanate directly from Council-mandated peacekeeping operations.

We believe that, if peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of a conflict is to succeed, focus should be on identifying context-sensitive approaches that will provide for sustainable national political dialogue aimed at reconciliation among the parties to the conflict, with the participation of all stakeholders. The involvement of all stakeholders in identifying key national priorities is essential, and the involvement of women in that process is a key element. Unity of vision should be maintained when designing a clear and coordinated mandate to define the leadership role of the United Nations agencies on the ground. Adequate attention should be provided at an early stage to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure the efficient use of scarce resources.

The President: I now call on the representative of Italy.

Mr. Terzi di Sant'Agata (Italy): Allow me first to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the Ugandan presidency of the Security Council for taking the initiative of convening this crucial debate on peacebuilding and for the invitation to take the floor. I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his timely report (S/2009/304) and his remarks. I would also like to thank Ambassador Heraldo Muñoz, Chairperson of the Peacebuilding Commission; Mr. Jordan Ryan, Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery at the United Nations Development Programme; and Mr. Alastair McKechnie, Director of the Fragile and Conflict-Affected Countries Group at the World Bank, for their important briefings.

I would like to align myself with the statement delivered by the Swedish Presidency of the European Union.

As underlined by the Secretary-General, the post-conflict phase offers a window of opportunity that can be essential in supporting countries previously involved in conflict in developing a path towards normalcy. However, in the phase of developing such a path, the situation often remains fluid and the peace fragile. Getting the timing and sequencing right among priorities requires a delicate balance, as the Secretary-General puts it. A coordinated approach is therefore needed, as are the definition of clear priorities and flexible tools and the availability of quickly deployable human and financial resources.

In that light, the revision of the terms of reference of the Peacebuilding Fund is very welcome. The international community as a whole should collaborate in that process at the multilateral and bilateral levels. Peacebuilding should be conceived as a single process in which everyone can participate and contribute in an integrated manner. That is the spirit in which the 2005 World Summit decided to establish the Peacebuilding Commission.

Italy welcomes the Secretary-General's report, since it represents a true road map for activities to be performed in the aftermath of a conflict — a real policy document for all the actors involved. The principle of national ownership is central. The peacebuilding intervention should be anchored at the country level — again, as stated by the Secretary-General — with the engagement of all the actors involved. That means an inclusive process sensitive to the requests of civil society.

The fundamental role of regional and subregional organizations — in particular, the African Union — must also be emphasized, as must the need to develop forms of collaboration within the United Nations. There is a need to improve the effectiveness and coherence of the United Nations system's response, along with the concept of accountable United Nations leadership on the ground.

An effective peacebuilding effort requires the capability on the ground to deploy civilian experts as well. We are encouraged by the positive assessment of the Standing Police Capacity, which constitutes a useful reference for building a rule-of-law standing capacity. Quite rightly, another review has been proposed on how the United Nations can help to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts.

The Peacebuilding Commission was created in 2005 to fill the gap between peacekeeping and post-conflict rehabilitation. It plays a central role by bringing coherence to the recovery of countries emerging from conflict. That is why it was decided that the Peacebuilding Commission should be an advisory body not only for the General Assembly, but also for the Security Council.

An interesting suggestion has been made by the Secretary-General that the Security Council consider more proactively the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission. We subscribe to this suggestion. It is an important point which aims at enhancing the consultative role of the Commission vis-à-vis the whole United Nations system and as the principal organ responsible for the definition of mandates and for conflict management.

Our approach to peacebuilding seeks to foster political and democratic stabilization while stimulating economic growth. In this framework, Italy's assistance in the energy sector in Sierra Leone is one example of the possibilities that we have at our disposal. Another example involves the fight against drugs and crime, an endeavour that is critical to peacebuilding. During its tenure in the Security Council, my country actively promoted the inclusion of these aspects in the mandates of the United Nations Offices in Sierra Leone and Guinea-Bissau, and contributed to a number of security sector reform and rule of law initiatives led by the Economic Community of West African States, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau.

My country intends to strengthen its technical support for the work of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in West Africa. A task force of selected police officers of the Guardia di Finanza, Italy's customs police, will be deployed in Dakar within the framework of UNODC's law enforcement capacity-building programme in the fight against illicit drug trafficking.

As the country chairing the G-8 this year, Italy has been actively engaged in fulfilling the commitment taken by the G-8 at Sea Island and Hokkaido. In the G-8 leaders' declaration, emphasis was placed on the need for a comprehensive approach to peacekeeping and peacebuilding. During the G-8 meeting in Trieste, prior to its meeting in L'Aquila, the G-8 foreign ministers welcomed the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict — the report we are discussing today — and encouraged all relevant actors to consider its recommendations.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Park In-kook (Republic of Korea): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing today's meeting. I also appreciate the Secretary-General's insightful and comprehensive report (S/2009/304) and his briefing on the five key points this morning.

The immediate aftermath of conflict presents a unique set of challenges and opportunities. That period is a most delicate and fragile time. Early action taken at that stage is critical because it will shape and determine the overall future of the peace process. It may not be an exaggeration to say that the window of opportunity for establishing sustainable peace depends mostly on how the immediate aftermath of the conflict is managed. My delegation welcomes the Secretary-General's report as an answer to this challenge and fully endorses the recommendations contained in the report. Looking forward to rapid and full implementation of those recommendations, I would like to highlight the following points.

First, our efforts in early recovery stages should be focused on having a quick impact on the ground. Immediately after the conflict, immense demands tend to arise in virtually every sector of the political, social and economic arenas, while the national capacity to accommodate these demands, virtually destroyed during the conflict, has yet to be restored. Thus, our efforts at this stage should be focused on meeting those most urgent and immediate demands and responding to peacebuilding priorities.

Among other tools, quick-impact projects have proven to be instrumental in this area. The United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire is one of the United Nations missions that are actively employing this tool with successful results. My delegation hopes that quick-impact projects will be more fully integrated into our peacebuilding strategies at their early stages.

Secondly, integrated leadership and expertise from the United Nations needs to be present on the ground at the earliest possible stage. In this vein, my delegation welcomes the recommendations of the

Secretary-General to establish senior-level leadership mechanisms and support teams that would be present on the ground at the earliest critical juncture. I also appreciate the recommendation to broaden the rapidly deployable civilian expert groups.

While peacebuilding efforts should be country-specific, in many cases involving post-conflict countries certain priorities are observed recurring at the early stages. With the experience and lessons learned so far, my delegation believes that we will be able to develop ready-made toolkits to address those recurring priorities.

Thirdly, the role and capacity of non-State actors and civil society need to be recognized and integrated into the peacebuilding process. As the report points out, we look forward to United Nations Volunteers playing a catalytic role in mobilizing civil capacity to re-establish the fabric of society. In addition, the role and participation of women in the process should be particularly ensured, as many of my colleagues have emphasized during today's debate.

Fourthly, while the strategic partnerships of the United Nations with the World Bank and other international financial institutions are imperative, more coherent partnerships with development agencies, most notably the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), should be reinforced. The early engagement of these agencies will ensure a smoother transition from early post-conflict stages to peacebuilding and ultimately to longer-term sustainable economic development. The expertise of UNDP in assisting national capacity will also be instrumental in early national capacity restoration. Additionally, how we can secure the synergy effect between the integrated peacebuilding offices and United Nations country teams is another area that deserves our close attention.

Fifthly, as Ambassador Muñoz properly pointed out this morning, we recommend that the Security Council consider the advice of the Peacebuilding Commission in a more proactive manner. There has been an increasing number of observations that peacekeepers are early peacebuilders. Moreover, the mandates of the current peacekeeping missions clearly overlap with peacebuilding activities, as is illustrated in the case of the United Nation Stabilization Mission in Haiti. Considering this fact, our discussion on peacekeeping missions should closely incorporate the peacebuilding aspect, especially in the early stages.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that national ownership is an indispensable principle in the peacebuilding process. National authorities should take the primary responsibility for rapidly re-establishing national institutions, restoring the rule of law and revitalizing economies. National ownership should also be respected in the consideration of the peacebuilding process in cases where advice is requested. When a post-conflict country requests to be advised by the Peacebuilding Commission, its request should be considered in a most prompt manner, focusing on the interests of the people on the ground.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Switzerland.

Mrs. Grau (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this debate. Allow me to focus on three aspects of the report (S/2009/304) that we are discussing today.

First, we welcome the exemplary consultation process for this report. That way of proceeding well illustrates the potential role of the Peacebuilding Support Office as a catalyst. To be effective, the Office should play that role in conjunction with strong leadership of the Secretary-General. The Security Council has an important role to play in supporting that combination by recognizing the functions of the two actors and by supporting them. In mission management in particular, we invite the Council to increase its consultation of the Peacebuilding Commission, whose potential asset is its ability to mobilize the skills of a wide range of actors.

We support the proposal that the Chairs of the country-specific meetings of the Peacebuilding Commission be invited to participate in the work of the subsidiary bodies of the Security Council concerning the countries in question. Before us, we have specific examples of the challenges of coherence, in the reports on mediation and on peacebuilding and in the New Horizon non-paper on peacekeeping. To head up those efforts concerning the crucial and complementary aspects of the United Nations system, we would like to see a note by the Secretary-General that highlights their complementarity and gives us an overview of the various available financial instruments. Only if the complementarity of instruments and the transparency of financial flows are considerably improved will there be more effective, flexible and predictable funding for peacebuilding.

Secondly, the report stresses the need to develop national and regional capacities and the skills of the senior managers and of the teams deployed on the ground. We welcome those recommendations, and my country is willing to share the experience acquired through our own pools of national experts.

The credibility and the effectiveness of the United Nations depend above all on the skills of its permanent staff and on a cross-cutting awareness of conflict issues within the various institutions of the United Nations system. Peacebuilding is not the exclusive preserve of any one body, but is the responsibility of all actors under the active leadership of the Secretary-General.

Thirdly, the United Nations and the World Bank, as well as our capitals, must provide the personnel in the field with the best possible support by establishing a more effective, coherent and coordinated support system. The report shows us that there are already a number of instruments that favour a joint approach, such as, for example, the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment or integrated task forces. We must ensure the effective use of those instruments and not multiply the reporting and the number of planning and monitoring instruments. That effort must be made jointly with the development banks, regional organizations and the donor community.

We are convinced of the importance of qualified leadership in the countries concerned, supported by an able team. In that regard, we would like the funds, programmes and specialized agencies to recognize strengthened authority of the Resident Coordinator vis-à-vis the United Nations country team, particularly when the Coordinator holds the post of Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General. We propose that the Chief Executives Board make a decision in that regard.

I would like to conclude by emphasizing the importance of measuring all improvements in processes and institutions by their positive impact in the field.

The President: After consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council recalls the statement of its President (S/PRST/2008/16) and emphasizes the critical importance of post-conflict peacebuilding as the foundation for building sustainable peace and development in the aftermath of conflict.

"The Security Council welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304) as an important contribution towards a more effective and coherent international response to post-conflict peacebuilding. The Council also welcomes the Secretary-General's strong commitment expressed in the report to improve the United Nations peacebuilding efforts, and urges him to pursue these objectives.

"The Security Council emphasizes the importance of national ownership and the need for national authorities to take responsibility as soon as possible for re-establishing the institutions of Government, restoring the rule of law, revitalizing the economy, reforming the security sector, providing basic services and other key peacebuilding needs. The Council underscores the vital role of the United Nations in supporting national authorities to develop an early strategy, in close consultation with international partners, to address these priorities, and encourages international partners to align their financial, technical and political support behind this strategy.

"The Security Council stresses the need, in countries emerging from conflict, to draw upon and develop existing national capacities at the earliest possible stage, and the importance of rapidly deployable civilian expertise to help achieve this, including, where appropriate, relevant expertise from the region. The Council, in this regard, welcomes the recommendation of the Secretary-General for a review to be undertaken to analyse how the United Nations and international community can help to broaden and deepen the pool of civilian experts, giving particular attention to mobilizing capacities from developing countries and especially women.

"The Security Council recognizes that post-conflict situations require from the outset experienced and skilled leadership on the ground with effective support teams, and requests the United Nations to increase its efforts in this

regard. The Council welcomes the Secretary-General's efforts to enhance the authority and accountability of senior United Nations representatives in carrying out their duties and responsibilities.

"The Security Council emphasizes the need for the United Nations system to strengthen strategic partnerships with the World Bank and other international financial institutions, and to complete by the end of 2009 the clarification of roles and responsibilities for key peacebuilding needs and to keep these under regular review, so that the appropriate expertise is generated to achieve a timely and predictable response.

"The Security Council recalls its resolution 1645 (2005) and recognizes the important role of the Peacebuilding Commission in promoting and supporting an integrated and coherent approach to peacebuilding, welcomes the progress it has achieved, calls on it to further enhance its advisory role and support for countries on its agenda and looks forward to the recommendations of the 2010 review of the Commission's founding resolutions on how its role can continue to be enhanced.

"The Security Council recognizes the critical importance of rapid, flexible and predictable funding for post-conflict peacebuilding. The Council urges Member States to help achieve this, building on the recommendations of the report and in particular increasing the impact of the Peacebuilding Fund, improving donor practices to make funding faster and more flexible and making use of in-country multi-donor trust funds, which are designed to accommodate the funding requirements of donors.

"The Security Council reaffirms that ending impunity is essential if a society recovering from conflict is to come to terms with past abuses committed against civilians affected by armed conflict and to prevent future such abuses. The Council notes that justice and reconciliation mechanisms can promote not only individual responsibility for serious crimes, but also peace, truth, reconciliation and the rights of victims.

"The Security Council, in accordance with its resolutions 1325 (2000) and 1820 (2008), underlines the key role women and young persons can play in re-establishing the fabric of society and stresses the need for their involvement in the development and implementation of post-conflict strategies in order to take account of their perspectives and needs.

"The Security Council reaffirms the role of regional and subregional organizations in the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, and the need to strengthen their capacity in post-conflict peacebuilding.

"The Security Council recognizes the importance of launching peacebuilding assistance at the earliest possible stage. The Council affirms the importance of early consideration of peacebuilding in its own deliberations and of ensuring coherence between peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development to achieve an early and effective response to post-conflict situations. The Council will strive to apply this integrated approach and requests the Secretary-General to intensify his efforts in this regard.

"The Security Council invites the Secretary-General to report within 12 months to the Security Council and the General Assembly on progress achieved in fulfilling his agenda for action to improve the United Nations peacebuilding efforts, taking into consideration the views of the Peacebuilding Commission."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/2009/23.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.55 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.6166

Security Council

Distr.: General
23 July 2009

Original: English

Official communiqué of the 6166th (closed) meeting of the Security Council

Held in private at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 23 July 2009, at 10 a.m.

In accordance with rule 55 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the following communiqué was issued through the Secretary-General in place of a verbatim record:

"On 23 July 2009, the Security Council, pursuant to annex II, sections A and B of resolution 1353 (2001), held its 6166th meeting in private with the troop-contributing countries to the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire.

"The Security Council and the troop-contributing countries heard a briefing under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure by Mr. Young-Jin Choi, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Head of the United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire.

"Members of the Council, Mr. Choi and representatives of participating troop-contributing countries had an exchange of views."

09-42030 (E) 230709

Please recycle

United Nations S/PV.6167

Security Council

Sixty-fourth year

Provisional

6167th meeting

Thursday, 23 July 2009, 10.45 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Rugunda	(Uganda)
Members:	Austria	Mr. Mayr-Harting
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Koudougou
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Guillermet
	Croatia	Mr. Vilović
	France	Mr. Lacroix
	Japan	Mr. Kimura
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Dabbashi
	Mexico	Mr. Puente
	Russian Federation	Mr. Dolgov
	Turkey	Mr. Çorman
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir John Sawers
	United States of America	Ms. DiCarlo
	Viet Nam	Mr. Hoang Chi Trung

Agenda

Letter dated 22 November 2006 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2006/920)

Report of the Secretary-General on the request of Nepal for United Nations assistance in support of its peace process (S/2009/351)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

09-41965 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 10.55 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 22 November 2006 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/2006/920)

Report of the Secretary-General on the request of Nepal for United Nations assistance in support of its peace process (S/2009/351)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Nepal, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Acharya (Nepal) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2009/377, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Members also have before them document S/2009/351, containing the report of the Secretary-General on the request of Nepal for United Nations assistance in support of its peace process.

I wish to draw the attention of members to document S/2009/360, containing the text of a letter dated 14 July 2009 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Austria, Burkina Faso, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, France, Japan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mexico, Russian Federation, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam

The President: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1879 (2009).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11 a.m.